Class 235.8 Book M429.3
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK.
Besides the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

PRESENTED BY
William A. Matson. D.D.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/adversaryhispers0000will

THE ADVERSARY.

THE ADVERSARY

HIS

PERSON, POWER, AND PURPOSE

A

STUDY IN

SATANOLOGY

BY

WILLIAM A. MATSON, D.D.

Third Edition, with Additions and New Preface.

NEW YORK
EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher
FOURTH AVENUE AND 22D STREET
1902

235.8
M429.3

40254

Copyright, 1902, by Edwin S. Gorham.

YANKEE COLLEGE
YALE

PREFACE.

THIS work was begun without any thought of publication, but simply as an interesting and instructive study. It grew, however, upon the author's hands. His notes became voluminous. Portions were made to furnish material for sermons and lectures, and for essays read at various times at meetings of the clergy. The manner in which these were received, the interest in the subject which they seemed to awaken, and the desire frequently expressed to see them in print, induced the author to pursue his inquiries further and prepare a work for publication. He knows of no book covering precisely this ground, treating the subject entirely from a Christian standpoint, and bringing the information here gathered to throw light upon topics of interest at the present day.

While thus engaged, there appeared from the pen of a scholar and theologian a work upon the same topic. While the views of the writers are in full accord, yet those portions of the discussion which the author of the present volume has refrained from dwelling upon at length, Professor Jewett has handled with ability, and with results most valuable to the theologian. On the other hand, it appeared that some topics which occupy no small portion of the present treatise had not come within the scope of the other work.

The book is sent forth from the press in the devout hope that it may guard the Christian layman against the Sadducean spirit of the age, and be helpful in suggesting topics of instruction to those who exercise the office of the Christian ministry.

NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

A SECOND edition is demanded within less than a year after the first appearance of this volume. The author regards its favorable reception, both as a kindly appreciation of his labors and as evidence that the subject is one of interest to Christian readers and thinkers who have felt the need of a work of this description to meet the Sadducean tendencies of the times.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

SKEPTICISM as to the personality of the great Adversary of souls is not confined to unbelievers and rationalists. In sending out a third edition of this work, the writer desires to call the attention of Christians to a doctrine once universally received in the Church, and which is still a protest against the Sadduceeism of our age.

It is becoming common for religious teachers to affirm that the Mosaic account of the Temptation and Fall is an allegory. But Saint Paul tells us that the story of Isaac and Ishmael is an allegory; and yet the record is true. So also with the offering of Isaac, the story of Joseph, the passage of the Red Sea. They are allegorical, and yet true.

But the awful mystery of sin, its entrance into this world, and its consequences here, are spiritual things which could not be detailed in ordinary historical narrative. We must learn them through symbol and figure.

That man was originally righteous, that he was tempted and sinned, that the taint of sin affected the human race, that through the Seed of the woman should come deliverance—these are facts underlying the whole system of doctrine in both the Old and New Testaments. Blot them out, and the whole scheme of redemption and salvation is unmeaning.

Hand-in-hand with a denial of the personality of the Devil, there is usually a general skepticism as to the supernatural.

Physical laws are regarded as sufficient to account for all phenomena. The Divine interposition in the affairs of men is ignored where not positively denied. And yet, every prayer we offer implies such interposition, overruling, guiding, restraining or blessing. The prayer that does not imply this is not honest. The prayer of faith implies the existence of a world that is not seen and of forces beyond the reach of our philosophy. It implies a personal God, the personality of the angels. It is but reasonable, therefore, to hold that Scripture is not deceiving us when it asserts the personality of fallen angels.

Surely, no one familiar with the works of the late Frederick Denison Maurice will suspect him of a tendency toward superstition or an inclination to suspect the supernatural when the ordinary course of nature will suffice. Here are his words of caution to the thinkers of our times. He is speaking of "the influence of evil spirits over the bodies of men," and he says:

"This belief we may often have been inclined to look upon as the most degrading and despicable of all, from which a sounder knowledge of physics and of the freaks and capacities of the human imagination has delivered us. Are we sure that the deliverance has been affected? Are we sure that the fears of an invisible world, of a world not to come, but about us, are extinct? . . . Are we sure that all our discoveries, or supposed discoveries, respecting the spiritual world within us, may not be appealed to in confirmation of a new demoniac system? Are we sure that the very enlightenment, which says that it has ascertained Christian stories to be legends, will not be enlisted on the same side, because if we only believe *these* facts, it will be so easy to show how *those* falsities may have originated? . . .

"You may talk against deviltry as you like; you will not get rid of it unless you can tell human beings whence comes that sense of tyranny over their own very selves, which they express in a thousand forms of speech, which excites them to the greatest, often the most profitless, indignation against the arrangements of this world, which tempts them to people it and Heaven, also, with objects of terror and despair.

"There is no disguising it; the assertion stands broad and patent in the four Gospels, construed according to any ordinary rules of language:—the acknowledgment of an Evil Spirit is characteristic of Christianity."

The following is from the pen of Canon Liddon:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ has identified the truth of this Doctrine of a personal Evil Spirit with His own character as an honest Teacher of the highest truth. We cannot consistently deny the doctrine and continue to revere the Teacher Who reaffirmed it so solemnly; we cannot exculpate Him as if He were some pagan philosopher who had a secret truth for his chosen friends while he patronized the current superstitions of the vulgar as being all that they were equal to."

To this edition has been added a chapter on Experience of Foreign Missionaries; and in the Appendix an exhaustive examination of the passages, Genesis vi., 1–4.

CONTENTS.

I.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY 13–26

Intermediate agencies — Forces of nature — Man, angels—Belief in evil angels or spirits resting on the same ground as belief in the good—Satan the leader of the fallen host—The author and source of evil—His personality distinctly asserted by our Lord and by the sacred writers—His agency apparent in all history—His existence and evil doings not the only difficult problem — The conflict between the Son of God and the Adversary—Christ the Conqueror.

II.

THE FALL OF THE ANGELS 27–34

Personal holiness implies free agency—Angels have the power to sin—Satan and his host sinned and fell—An ancient hypothesis—"Reserved in chains of darkness"—Dr. Dollinger's views.

III.

THE FALL OF MAN 35–43

Man's fall and that of the angels compared—The story of the fall discloses the nature of sin—Sorrow

PAGE

and suffering solely due to sin—The "course and constitution" of the world necessarily changed by the introduction of sin.

IV.

SATAN'S AGENCY IN THE AFFLICTIONS OF JOB..... 44–49

The story of Job explains much of our own experience—The purpose of Job's trial—Satan's character and power disclosed—Why permitted to assail the faithful.

V.

ANGELI MALORUM AND SATAN'S FALSE PROPHETS AND LYING SPIRITS..... 50–61

Distinction between evil spirits and angels of wrath as ministers of justice—The Adversary in Zech. III. —Distinction between God's doing and permitting—Ahab and the prophets of Baal—Macaiah's allegory —Persian and Hebrew ideas compared.

VI.

DEVILS AND DEVIL-WORSHIP MENTIONED IN THE SCRIPTURES..... 62–70

Azazel—How heathen divinities were regarded by the Prophets—Heathen ideas of demons—"Offerings of the dead"—Goat demons—The Talmudists.

VII.

DIVINERS, NECROMANCERS, ETC..... 71–82

Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh, confronting the magicians of Egypt—Satan as a miracle-worker—The "Witch of Endor."

VIII.

PAGE

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS AND THE DEMONIACAL POSSESSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. 82–98

Satan's knowledge limited—Manner of the Temptation — "Get thee behind me, Satan" — Impossible that our Lord or the sacred writers could have regarded demoniacal possessions as mere diseases—The miracle at Gadara—Satan restrained—Character of the "possessions."

IX.

THE EVIL OVERRULED 99–107

The consequences of sin necessary in the nature of things—Two courses supposable; the course divinely ordained brings good out of the evil—Satan's own weapons turned upon himself.

X.

SPIRITUAL INFLUENCES, GOOD AND EVIL 108–120

Good impulses imply a Holy Spirit—Evil impulses a spirit of evil—"Possession" by the good or by the evil—Willing obedience or dominion and mastery—The demon of drink—Responsibility not lost—A rescue at hand.

XI.

HISTORY—EARLIEST ACCOUNTS.....121–138

The Chaldean records—Ancient dualism—Rabbinical demonology — The early Christian Church — Justin Martyr—Demoniacal possessions in the first centuries of the Church—How controlled and expelled.

XII.

PAGE
HISTORY—CONTINUED.....139–147

Exorcism—S. Cyril—The Reformers—Becker—Guelinx—Thomasius—Effect of superstition.

XIII.

POST-REFORMATION PERIOD.....148–155

German rationalism — Farmer — Doctrine of the Church of England—Maurice.

XIV.

HISTORY—CONTINUED.....156–162

Influence of unseen powers and intelligences a question of fact—Witchcraft—How far theology responsible for the delusion.

XV.

MODERN DIABOLISM.....163–178

Testimony generally unreliable—M. Huc—Tinnevelley Shanars—Devil-worshippers—Dr. Wolff's experience—"Satyrs shall dance there"—A "possession" at Gaza—Superstition in Polynesia; in India.

XVI.

DIABOLISM AND LUNACY.....179–189

Distinction made in the New Testament—The ecclesiastic vs. the physician—Difference between pure lunacy and demoniacal possession—Testimony from the prison—Other testimonies.

PAGE

XVII.

NECROMANCY, MODERN SPIRITUALISM, AND SUPRANATURAL FORCES.....190–208

Delusions or real?—The Rochester rappings—The phenomena at the home of the Wesleys—Experience of Jacolliot in India—Conclusions as to "Spiritualism."

XVIII.

OCCULT ARTS, MAGIC SORCERY, ETC.....209–227

The burning of the magical books at Ephesus—Occult arts condemned by the early Church—Spectres—Hypnotism—The lawful and the forbidden—The sure protection against the delusions of the Adversary.

XIX.

EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN MISSIONARIES.....228–237

Dr. Nevius' personal observations—possessions in Fatshan and Chefoo and other places in China.

APPENDIX A.....238

APPENDIX B.....241

APPENDIX C.....245

APPENDIX D.....247

APPENDIX E.....248

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

In Moses' record of the creation, we learn that God was the immediate Creator and Life-giver. "God said, let there be * * * and there was * * *" He, Himself, spake and directed, without any intervening cause or agent. There was then neither law nor course of nature. He was the Supreme and only Force. But says St. John: "The Word was with God and was God." "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made." Then "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," and imparted life. Creation then was the direct and immediate work of the three Persons in One God, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit.

Now, however, there are intermediate agencies. God, indeed, directs and moves all things, but not immediately. Now, indeed, as in all the past He does all things; but He does not each day bid the sun to shine and the night to

draw her drapery over the landscape. He does not bid each separate seed to spring up, nor each tree to put on its foliage. When He made the sun He taught it once for all to shine. When He placed the stars in their orbits, He ordained a force whose continued and ever-active agency was a second cause, by the means of which all bodies were to keep to their limits, "thus far, and no farther." When He said, "let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth"; "let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth"; "let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth after his kind,"—all this asserts God's ordering and appointing at the first the reproductive system of the world; the course of nature; a series of agencies through which He ever works. What then God did on the day of creation He did Himself, directly and immediately. What He does now He does through the forces of nature.

But there are other agencies. We are familiar with the important part the insects fulfil in the operations of nature. In some departments, without their services the propa-

gation of some plants would be impossible. Here then is an agency that is living, and possessed of just that degree of intelligence which is implied in instinct. The little creature toils on with its marvellously ingenious work, all unconscious of the purpose it serves; but it is an agent of God, working out His designs.

But again, unless we take the position that this globe of ours was made for nought, that all its vast and intricate mechanism and all that transpires upon its surface is but blind and aimless, all ordained for no possible object whatever, then it must be admitted that man, the highest living intelligence, the image of his God, in all the achievements of his mind and in all the greatness of his history, in his conquest of obstacles and in his dominion over the forces of nature and the elements, is working towards some definite end, is achieving some appointed purpose, and thus that God is accomplishing that end and purpose through man, His instrument and agent.

All this is within our experience, observation, and perception. But we pass beyond this now to the region where our philosophy cannot go, for it lies within a world unseen, the knowledge of which comes to us through God's written revelation. On that authority we learn that just as, ever since the creation, God has

wrought through the second causes of nature as His agents, through living creatures, and especially through man as an instrumentality, so He also operates through the agency of angels who are ministering spirits.

As then in nature and in the course of Providence there are the second causes, both of mechanical and chemical force and of human intelligence, so, also, are there other intelligent second causes, viz.: angels or spirits. Not necessarily,—as according to some of the ancients—that all the forces of nature are endowed with intelligence, are angels, but that in administering the affairs of the world the ministry of angels is employed.

In all Scripture, in both the Old Testament and the New, sufficient mention is made of these celestial ones to teach us of an order of beings incorporeal, pure, holy, untrammelled by the aims, desires, and passions of men, as they are independent of time and space; ministers and agents of God, having their abode in the courts of Heaven, whence they go forth to fulfil the office assigned, and to which they return to dwell in glory and to worship around the throne of God.

I do not stop to prove that there is a God, or that the Bible is His word. But, inasmuch as there were in former days Sadducees, who,

though avowed followers of Moses, yet denied that there was either angel or spirit, so modern times have produced those who, without avowedly rejecting the Bible, are yet unquestionably skeptical upon the same points. And even where the existence of good angels is not denied, the fact of the existence of evil angels, and particularly of Satan the chief of the fallen spirits, is called in question.

They who admit that there are good angels, good spirits or messengers of God to execute His will, must found their belief upon the statements of Scripture. But we also read of the Devil and his angels who kept not their first estate; "angels that sinned and were cast down to hell"; "the angel of the bottomless pit," and the like.

Now, if the language of Scripture proves the existence of angels of one kind, then language of the same description proves the existence of angels of the other kind. The passages that prove the one are as clear and decisive as those that prove the other. And surely if the word angel in Scripture ever means anything more than a mere messenger, then "fallen" angel means something more than merely a messenger who has neglected his duty. And yet, in the New Testament more frequent mention is made of fallen than of unfallen angels.

But who, and what are they? The answer, in the words of Scripture, is the "angels that kept not their first estate"; "angels that sinned and were cast down to hell." But the expression "the Devil and his angels" implies a chief or leader among them, as does also the title "the angel of the bottomless pit." As to who this chief is the following passage leaves no question:—"that old serpent,* called the Devil and Satan which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth and his angels were cast out with him." (Rev. xii. 9.) The same character is styled "the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon." (Rev. ix. 11.)

This leader of the fallen host is he who is termed in Scripture, Satan, Tempter, Accuser, Adversary, the Evil One, Murderer, Liar, and the Father of lies, Prince of darkness, Prince of this world, God of this world, Serpent, Tormentor, and the Enemy.

This enemy of God and man has, what all angels have, power and intellect. As a spirit he has what all spirits have, personality, untrammelled,—we know not to what degree—by the conditions of time and space. He has

* Dean Alford calls attention to the fact that the term is ἀρχαῖος, "who was of old."

all these. But his fall seems to have consisted in an utter reversal of his moral nature. For, whereas the unfallen are essentially holy, he is essentially the opposite. All his instincts, impulses, motives, and intentions are directed to what is bad. Good angels exist only to execute God's will; he only to thwart and defeat it; they to minister peace, comfort, and strength, and to suggest good thoughts to the righteous, helping them on their way to heaven; he only to corrupt, lead them astray, and drag them down to hell; they to promote happiness; he to afflict with sorrow, calamity, and misery. And whereas the righteous are ever conscious of and seek deliverance from their infirmities and sins, they who are in complete subjection to Satan cherish in their hearts, and glory in exhibiting in their conduct, crimes, and the most depraved emotions and passions. That which is good to one is evil to the other. These are the characteristics of Satan, his angels and his victims.

In the story of the Fall we have the human race perfectly good. There is no evil on earth until Satan suggests sin. The sin is the free act of our first parents, but the act is suggested and urged from without. The suggestion is made by some being—an evil being—who thus introduces evil into the world. Who is that

being? The record says: "Now the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field; and he said unto the woman * * *" But the Scripture nowhere regards the serpent as the prime cause and originator of the evil, but only as the instrument.* As is said in the Book of Wisdom (ii. 24), "through envy of the Devil came death into the world." Throughout the New Testament it is the Devil who is regarded as the original source of evil. "The Devil sinneth from the beginning." The wicked are styled the children of the Devil.

No just interpretation can divest our Lord's words of the meaning they actually conveyed to His hearers, and which, placed upon permanent record, they must bear to all time. He cast out devils, and His adversaries claimed that He did so by compact with Beelzebub, the Prince of the Devils. His reply asserts the fact of the existence of Satan, of his kingdom, and of the Spirit and kingdom of God arrayed in opposition thereto. "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house divided against a house falleth. If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye

* Whatever the serpent was originally he is not now remarkable for his cunning. The curse pronounced upon him may have involved the loss of his subtilty.

say that I cast out devils through Beelzebub. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore, shall they be your judges. But if I, with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you. When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace; but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils."

The fact of the existence of Satan, of his kingdom, and its opposition to the kingdom of God could not be more strongly or more distinctly asserted, unless He were to say in so many words,—"there is a spirit, a devil, named Satan, who opposes the kingdom of God and has a kingdom in opposition thereto upon earth." But this was what His hearers already knew. They needed no teaching upon that subject.

In perfect keeping with the character which Scripture has given him have been the deeds of the Devil in all the world's history.

Follow his career in the records of God's chosen people: consecrated, separated, and compassed by many a precaution, and yet through all their history, under judges, prophets, and kings, under judgments and mercies,

captivities and triumphs, like howling wolves the demons of Satan track their path, again and again break in upon the fold, scattering and devouring the prey.

Then came that greatest deed of all diabolical wickedness, the rejection and the crucifixion of the Son of God. Satan's kingdom then indeed received its death-blow, yet still he fought his Conqueror. He persecuted the Church. When it had triumphed over paganism he corrupted a triumphant Church. Then he divided it. When still disciples multiplied he summoned atheism and the skepticism of a "science falsely so called," heresies, schisms, apostacies, and lukewarmness. It is the old serpent, the dragon carrying on a determined and desperate struggle with the saints.

Can it be? Is it not of all things most preposterous to suppose that an Enemy, and that Enemy a personal Agent, should be permitted, and oftentimes with apparent success, to do battle against God, to perpetuate misery and woe and make this world a charnel-house of the dead in trespasses and sins?

When you shall have solved another problem you may take that solution and apply it to this. Can it be possible? Is it not preposterous to believe that a just, a holy God, whose power no force can withstand, and whose wisdom no arts

can circumvent, that such a God should permit tyrants, the persecutors of the righteous, oppressors of the helpless, the corrupters of virtue, the spoilers of widows and orphans, to revel in their triumphs? And yet every cry of down-trodden and enslaved peoples, the Christian under the heel of the Moslem; the Jews, for centuries in the fangs of sheep-clothed wolves bearing the Christian name; the shelterless and helpless wife and children, bruised and shivering victims of the drunkard; every echo to the martyr's cry, "How long, O Lord! how long?" all bear witness to the stubborn and revolting fact that the world abounds in human monsters, defying God and trampling upon all that is pure and noble in manhood. And yet they live and prosper; and they riot in their sin, unscathed by the lightning of God's wrath. It is all a part of one and the same problem, that in the government of God evil is tolerated at all. If it be true (and none can deny it) that there are cunning and powerful man-monsters, is it any easier to reconcile this with the fact of God's government than the truth that there is a spirit who is a monster of iniquity, exercising the power and prerogative of spirit?

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifest,—that He might destroy the works of the

Devil." And He is destroying. It is truly marvellous to follow His conquering arm in all the great crises of history; to mark how each important success of Satan is made to turn upon the adversary himself. The fact of sin has been, so to speak, incorporated into the system of the moral government of the world. Deeds which it is a sin for man to do are made to work in the cause of right and truth. That awful sin, the crucifixion of the Redeemer, made Jesus a sacrifice for the sins of the world. Jesus "destroying the works of the Devil" is the conflict of the ages, begun at the fall of man, to end only with time.

Still, as yet, "our adversary the Devil goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." He may not take possession now as of old, of the bodies of men, but he bears down upon every unguarded point, and through our bodily weaknesses would make us his captives. It is something more than natural infirmity with which we have to contend. "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world"; against "the prince and power of the air." Those were no unmeaning words of Jesus, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." His healing of the possessed with demons was no mere accommo-

dation to prevalent language and ideas. He called them demons,* He spoke to them as demons; they answered Him as demons. It was not the craziness of a lunatic, but the spirit of fiends that left the Gadarene and plunged the herd of swine into the sea. Our Lord was sending down no falsehood to delude the Church in after ages when He taught that the evils that infest the Kingdom of God are the tares that an enemy has sown, and that Enemy is the Devil. And He showed His disciples in all ages what Enemy to fear, when, teaching how to pray, He composed the petition which our accepted translation does not express, though His words uttered it, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the EVIL ONE."†

Satan is that wicked one, the Enemy, that sowed the evil seed. The tares and the wheat are to grow together until the harvest, the great separation at the end of the world. But beyond that end is another when the Great Conqueror shall "put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." But the Mighty Victor became par-

* The distinction between διάβολος and δαίμων is lost in our translation. Δαίμων is used in speaking of demoniacal possessions, and refers to the possessing spirits. Διάβολος is never applied to these, but only to their prince.—KITTO.

† See Appendix A.

taker of our flesh, "that through death He might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is the Devil."

The seldom trodden path in which my readers are invited to accompany me is one of investigation:—to ascertain what the Word of God reveals; what has been the teaching and what the experience of the Church as to the personality of evil; what is to be learned of the fall of the Evil One and his angels from their lofty estate; what the scope and the limits of his power; and what the nature of his kingdom. The object will not be merely to gratify even a laudable curiosity, but that we may have a more intelligent conception of the nature of that conflict to which as Christians we are pledged.

CHAPTER II.

THE FALL OF THE ANGELS.

It is a sufficiently saddening thought that man, made in God's image, made innocent and pure, without a thought or emotion inclining him to sin, should yet have yielded to an allurement from without, become a rebel against his Heavenly Father and King, and a subject and servant of Satan. This is saddening enough, and the record of all its consequent woes is graven on every page of human history. It is written in the sweat of man's brow toiling on an accursed ground; in every pang, in every tear, in every sin, and on the cross of the Redeemer.

But angels dwelling in the presence of God, in all the glory and beauty and joy of heaven —that they should sin, lose all and gain nothing but the malediction of the Almighty, the total reversal of their nature, becoming the instruments and authors of evil and all that is alien from God—this was a fall indeed from a greater height to a lower depth than man's.

How could this possibly have been? If they were tempted, who could have been their tempter but some already fallen being? And how came the first angel to fall? We ask the sacred Book, and it is silent. This only we know: that is not piety, that is not to God acceptable service which is not willing service. Whoever is holy is so because he freely chooses to be so, not because impelled thereto as by the blind instinct of a brute, nor forced like a machine. But the free will to do implies the power not to do. Voluntary holiness is when one freely wills to obey, while he has the power not to obey.

We need not, then, go further than to say that the first angel who fell, being a free agent, had the power to sin and chose to do so. Why or for what object the angels kept not their first estate, what pride impelled or what ambition allured them we may not certainly know. But sin cannot be in heaven, and hence they were cast down to await in darkness and chains their final judgment.

We stand amazed at the thought that there should be beings possessed of power and intelligence far beyond that of which we can form any conception, and yet, bearing towards man a most desperate hatred; full of malice and all wickedness themselves, and seeking to

draw man away from God, to a condition as vile as their own.

There is a hypothesis not of modern device, older than our science, and consequently not open to the imputation of having been devised to reconcile the spiritual conceptions of religion with the materialism of an atheistic philosophy.

Modern science states that this globe, or at least the elements that compose it, were in existence for a period of immeasurable duration before it became fitted for the habitation of man. And this is reconciled with Scripture by an opinion which was held by many learned Jews long before Christianity, and by some of the early and most eminent Christian writers, none of whom knew anything of modern science, viz.: that the first words of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," refer to a period inconceivably remote from the date of the fitting of our globe for the habitation of man.

But it has been thought that the phrase, "the earth was without form and void," describes a state of confusion and disorder such as the wreck of a former world would be. The hypothesis then is that God had created a world vast and beautiful, an abode of angels; that these reared against the Almighty the standard of rebellion; that the legions of

Satan were vanquished, and this globe of ours became a total wreck and ruin, without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep—a wreck and ruin which would have been eternal but that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the chaotic mass and order began. And then, after six successive fiats, each one, it may be, marking a triumph over opposing forces of evil, the Sabbath of rest dawned upon the discomfited and routed forces of Satan; and God, the Creator of all, bestowing upon all His benediction, "very good," "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

The hypothesis has this to support it: When man was placed upon this earth angels were in existence. They had been created at some time within that period, "in the beginning" and the sixth day. And during that interval also the angels fell. Their fall, as the Scripture informs us, was in consequence of a revolt against God their Creator. Now if, in consequence of man's fall into sin, the whole course of nature so far as our earth was concerned was affected, sorrow and death the fate of the inhabitants, and thorns, thistles, and barrenness upon the surface of the ground, it is by no means an unreasonable inference

that when angels—angels "greater in power and might" and of more perfect nature—fell, there would come a far greater calamity upon the sphere of their abode, whatever or wherever that may have been.

The hypothesis that our earth is made of the ruins of a former world, the abode of angels who fell, is not indeed to be set down as a Christian doctrine. It is a theory supported by an interpretation which some of the fathers have given to certain passages of Scripture, and by the traditions of the ancient synagogues. It is upheld by some modern scholars, among whom is the distinguished German theological writer, Friedrich von Schlegel. Bishop Williams of Connecticut, speaking of this opinion, commends it to attention as being a view which in nowise offends the analogy of the faith, and is not contradicted by any portion of the Scriptures. And, one word more upon this—we all regard as a confirmation of the Mosaic account of the Deluge, the fact that in every ancient nation and tribe on the globe are traditions of that event. But equally prevalent are the traditions of a period in the long, long past ages, when the earth was the field of a mighty contest between the divine powers and the forces of apostates.

There was indeed a conflict between the

hosts of good and the hosts of evil, of which it may be true that our globe was the scene. And taking that thought of the ancients that the wreck and ruin of our world was the disaster of the angels' fall, if this indeed be true, it requires no great effort of imagination to read the story of the conflict graven as with a pen of adamant upon the rocks of the earth, entombed in its ghastly caverns, and echoed in the volcano and the earthquake. The volcano and the earthquake of to-day are the faint and dying echoes of what this globe of ours once witnessed, from the equator to either pole.

But S. Peter tells us that these rebel spirits were cast down to hell, and reserved in chains of darkness to the judgment. This is in apparent contradiction of what we read elsewhere of the machinations of the devil and his angels for the ruin of man: that their field of operation is here, not merely in hell; that Satan is not chained, but "goeth about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour"; and that all the temptations we endure are the instigations of spirits of evil, who range wherever a victim may be found.

It is, however, a remarkable fact that S. Peter in the verse referred to does not use for the term hell any word that is employed in any of the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures. Here

for the first and only time in the Bible the Greek word ταρταρος is used. It is not a Scripture term at all, and we go therefore to the Greeks to learn its meaning. According to some it is the regions of the air; with others it is the bounds or verge of this material system. Sometimes, indeed, a more definite location is given, as beneath the earth, the bowels of the earth. But S. Peter evidently uses it in the former sense, making his meaning correspond with the language of S. Paul, who styles Satan the "prince of the power of the air." Again, "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Darkness it is to them by contrast with the regions of light from which they were expelled; and as being the spiritual darkness of sin, while the chains are the limitation of their power and range—bounds beyond which they are not permitted to go.

On Jude 6, and II. Peter ii. 4, I quote from Dr. Dollinger:

"The darkness of this world is the region by which and to which they are bound and where they rule. They are lords of the world whose element is the darkness belonging to its then condition, the whole moral and relig-

ious state of the heathen world; they are the 'spirits of wickedness' who have their dwelling in the air surrounding the earth; impure spirits, banished from the kingdom and service of God, and become slaves of Satan; the instruments and ministers of his hostility to God and man. They believe that God is, but being apostates from His love and hardened in selfishness, tremble before Him, knowing or suspecting that He will take away their dominion over the heathen world and judge them. (James ii. 19.)

"The 'demoniacs,' or possessed, who existed in considerable numbers in Palestine and throughout heathendom, many of whom were delivered by the word of Jesus and the Apostles and disciples, were conspicuous examples of the powers of these spirits at a time when they collected all their strength in vindication of their menaced dominion. Their condition, as was commonly believed among the Jews, was the result of a demoniacal influence exerted over their bodily nature, and its usual symptoms were epilepsy, madness, melancholy, and deafness; they felt themselves in bondage and their body and its organs subjected to an alien mastery." (Luke vi. 18; ix. 39; xiii. 16; Matt. xvii. 15; Acts viii. 7; xvi. 16.)

CHAPTER III.

THE FALL OF MAN.

As already stated, an essential feature of the holiness of the angels is the fact that such holiness is not compulsory. They are of their own free choice holy. But this implies the power of choosing to sin. They made that choice. They sinned and they fell.

Going back to man, as God placed him in Eden, we can suppose him precisely like the angels in this respect: while his nature was holy, he yet had a free will, and that implied the power to sin.

But why should he sin? He was placed in lordship over this beautiful and glorious world, and the most fair and lovely portion of it was his home. Not a noble aspiration of soul but was met and satisfied, not a taste or wish becoming the lordly person he was but could find culture there. He came into the world an heir to a noble heritage, and he himself and all around bore the benediction of God. Why should he sin? He had the power to do

so indeed, as a free agent, but what was the inducement?

There came into this beauteous abode (how or why permitted is not now the subject of inquiry), disguised in the form of a serpent, that one who in heaven had lifted his arm against the Almighty and led a rebellious host; and who, cast down from on high, now sought to lead astray and make captive the first and head of the human race.

One thing only could man do that was sinful. The range of Eden, the range of the world was his, and everywhere, whatever invited was innocent, was lawful. The ban of prohibition was upon one thing, and one alone: "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. ii. 17.) Why then should our first parents sin? They did not sin until this crafty Adversary, a person, a fallen angel, came to persuade them. He saw their bliss; and, contrasting it with his own wretchedness, envied the happy pair (and envy has its malignant satisfactions if not its happiness)—and at the same time, stung, chagrined, and infuriated by his defeat, would drag man down to his own outcast estate, and make him as wretched and miserable as himself.

As the angels had fallen, so man fell. But inasmuch as the angels had, so to speak, fallen without temptation, simply of their own will, so, if this be so, their fall was without an extenuating circumstance. They had chosen without any outside temptation to place their will in opposition to the will of God; and their fall consisted in being left to the choice they had made: their will irrevocably in opposition to the will of God; and this implies a moral nature totally reversed. They had chosen rebellion, and that remains their choice forever.

But as for man, inasmuch as a persuader had allured him to sin, which, without that persuasion, he might not have committed, and his nature, which otherwise might have remained holy, became corrupt, he was left with a nature no longer holy, but perverted, giving the tempter thereafter easy access to his heart; yet still a free agent, God giving him the power to choose between the solicitations of the Devil on the one side, and of the Holy Spirit sent by the Redeemer, the Restorer of Paradise, on the other.

The nature of sin is here disclosed to us in the story of the Fall. A very common and worldly conception of sin is, wrong or damage done, with evil intent, to some fellow-being.

A man may go through life in utter neglect of distinctively Christian duties. He may not pray; he may not enter the house of God; he may be an entire unbeliever in a written revelation; he may possibly even be an atheist. If now we can suppose such a person to be an honest and kind neighbor, a just and upright citizen, the world may think that he has missed much by not being a religious man. But while religion would teach him that he has neglected half his duty, the world does not rank him a sinner. Or if it concedes that technically he is such, yet it is a matter of little moment.

But in Eden there was no possibility of wronging a neighbor; and consequently sin did not lie in that direction. Nor was there a temptation to anything in itself debasing to the character. Satan did not appeal to anything that was low and vile in itself. Fruit pleasant to the eye and to the taste, there was nothing evil in that, nor in the fact that it was "to be desired to make one wise." Everything was free. The sole and simple prohibition was "Thou shalt not touch." The simple "Thou shalt not" expressed God's will. The woman acknowledged this, and therefore she had not, up to that time, touched the forbidden fruit. But, observe the process. First,

Satan tempts her to doubt whether what God has commanded is really for her good. The next step is to lead her to doubt if what God has threatened, "Thou shalt surely die," will actually come to pass. And then, the fear of consequences being removed, her will is brought directly face to face with what she knows and has acknowledged to be the will of God. On the one side pleasant to the eye; good for food; to be desired to make one wise. On the other side, the "Thou shalt not." Her sin, then, was this, and this alone—exercising her own choice in opposition to the will of God.

We now learn what sin is, and that there may be sin that has nothing to do with one's duty to his fellow-man; that there are other sins besides dishonesty and perfidy and fraud and self-dishonor, and "a transgression of the bounds given in the nature and constitution of man." Such are sins, indeed, but they do not look above the horizon of this world. Whereas, we are taught in the story of the Fall that the essential principle of sin is opposition to the will of God. And any true philosophy will show that every evil done to man, and every wrong done to self, resolves itself in the last analysis to this: a will in opposition to the will of God.

We have seen that Satan was the cause of the sin that is in the world. But sorrow and suffering are the consequence of sin, as are all the disorders of Nature. They are no part of the original plan and purpose. Search creation through, and you will find every creature and every part and organ of the creature made to subserve the purposes of use and happiness. You cannot find in the whole expanse of creation one being or part or organ or atom, even, that was created for the sole purpose of giving pain or producing sorrow. There are pain and sorrow in abundance, but nothing was ever created for the purpose of producing suffering. These, then, are the proofs of disorder,—a perversion, a distorting of what was made with some benevolent design.

Public calamities are not the order of the universe, but its disorder. The hidden powers far beneath the surface of the earth have broken their bonds and the ground heaves in convulsive throes. The fire has broken loose from the control of man, and city and forest become a blackened ruin. The waters have overstepped their defined barriers, and sweeping in fury over plain and valley, have left in their path homes, households, and property a wreck. But the elements were not made for

such purpose. They were made to serve the needs of man, not for destruction and ruin. These are disorders, and disorder implies a departure from that which God, who made these forces, in His goodness and wisdom ordered.

In Paradise, where was no sin, there was no sorrow and no pain. In the restored Paradise, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

By the "course and constitution of things" we mean nature as it now is, with its causes and effects, its sequences, its light and darkness, and the construction and operation of its mechanism. Our inquiries can go back no further than as things have been made. It is useless to ask why the universe was not constructed differently, why any of its atoms or forces are as they are instead of being otherwise; or why such disorder should prevail as the consequence of sin. All speculations of this kind are simply idle. Taking things, then, just as they are, we find certain necessary conditions: Take away light and there is necessarily darkness. Remove heat and there is cold. Obstruct order and there

is confusion. Into a reservoir filled with gas of one kind introduce another, and you have a changed atmosphere, healthy or deadly, as the case may be. Into a mind pure and innocent you introduce a knowledge of sin, and you awaken what was latent or dormant and the character or the disposition, or at least the tendency, is changed. That person has the same mental and physical capacities as before, but what has been introduced has produced a change.

As under the former condition there were certain things necessary, certain possibilities and impossibilities, so, after the Fall, some things must be as consequences, and cannot possibly be otherwise. If we love fervently, we have happiness in that love. When the object, whether a person or possession or pursuit, or power and facilities for study or accumulation are taken away, we experience sorrow. If we enjoy health because of the unobstructed exercise and operation of the functions of nature, the effect of disease or of violence upon the organs will be the opposite of enjoyment,—pain and suffering. It is impossible that it should be otherwise.

God, then, did not make this world a scene of sorrow. It was not His purpose that it should be such, but the contrary. It became

what it is by the deed of Satan, in opposition to the will of God. Just as now, in a world where God desires the goodness of all, where He has given and revealed in His Incarnate Son redemption for all, where every inducement, such as the peace, the happiness, the highest welfare of society, are for piety and against sin,—in such a society a man has the power to go about and lure the innocent to vice, to the commission of crimes of violence, to become a moral pest. Or, clad as an angel of light, one robed in learning and culture and eloquence can use his powers to undermine that faith which is the basis of the morals and civilization of the land; can ridicule as a phantom that fear of God, which, beneath and behind all human laws and penalties, restrains from overt acts of crime, and actually holds back the desponding from suicide; can laugh the widow and the fatherless and the sorrow-stricken out of their prayers, and out of that trust in God which is their only hope, and their sure solace in sadness. Just as all this is permitted to be, so we can understand how, but not why, a wicked and fallen angel was permitted to enter Paradise, to seduce the innocent to that sin which opened the door for all the woes that have since afflicted humanity.

CHAPTER IV.

SATAN'S AGENCY IN THE AFFLICTIONS OF JOB.

THE word Satan occurs in Scripture for the first time in the book of Job.

Among the various opinions entertained by commentators, that adopted by the present writer is that the book of Job is a true history, but with a poetic treatment.

The scene in heaven where the "sons of God" are assembled and Satan appears among them need not be regarded as a narrative of what actually took place in the courts above, but, as it has been styled, "a piece of allegorical scenery, somewhat resembling the council of the gods in Homer." Its truthfulness is like that of a painting, in which the accessories only are according to the poet's conception.

In the story of the patriarch we shall find the meaning of many of our own personal sorrows and the solution of some difficult problems. The afflictions of the righteous in sickness, misfortunes and circumstances of intense, peculiar, and protracted grief, apparently

in the face of all that is just and compassionate—all this seems incompatible with the idea that we are under the care and government of a just God, a tender and loving Father, who is pleased to accept the consecration of our hearts to Him. But the lesson of the book of Job is that there is a special Providence; a God who hears and answers prayer; that the afflictions which befall the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked are permitted for some wise purpose; that all will work together for good; and that God's righteousness and love and fatherly care will be vindicated in the end.

Here was a man eminently righteous, and deservedly honored by high and low. He was blessed by the poor, the fatherless, the ready to perish, the widow and the orphan, whose protector he was, and whose cause he vindicated, to the discomfiture of the wicked. Such a man was blessed with abundant prosperity and happiness, in worldly goods and in family. But this was not all. His abundance, instead of lifting him up with pride and causing him to forget God—as is, alas! too frequently the case with the prospered—impelled him to extraordinary acts of devotion. He seems to have looked upon distrust of God, a denial of His Providence, as a sin to which the prosper-

ous were peculiarly exposed, and which he feared his own children might commit. Accordingly, every day he offered sacrifice for them, fearing lest they might have "renounced" (which is the true meaning of that word "cursed") God in their hearts.

While, then, Job was exhibiting in all his demeanor a life of spotless integrity and piety, there was in heaven a scene of which the patriarch was all unconscious, and of which the poet gives a dramatic sketch. Into the assembly of the sons of God, or angels, Satan enters. He is represented as acting without the approval or sanction of God, "going to and fro in the earth and walking up and down in it."

Like many of his servants,—who, fancying that others' characters are but a reflection of their own, seem incapable of believing that one can serve God or do a good action without some mercenary motive,—Satan virtually demands, "And why should not Job be pious? God has set about him a hedge which no misfortune can penetrate. Let the finger of God but crumble to dust his possessions, and the very deed he abhors he will himself commit: he will renounce God to His face." Hengstenberg here directs attention to the fact that the Almighty takes the initiative. "Not only

must Satan receive God's permission before he can proceed one step against Job, but the very occasion through which he obtains that permission is gratuitously provided for him by God." "The Lord said to Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power, but save his life."

It is a challenge to Satan to turn Job from his integrity if he can. The adversary accepts the challenge, but would make God the author of the evil—"Put forth now Thy hand and touch all that he hath." But this God does not do. He allows Satan to put forth his own hand: "Behold, all that he hath is in thy power." It was not God, therefore, but Satan, that overwhelmed Job with calamity. It was Satan that instigated the Sabean bands to murder the servants and bear away the cattle; it was Satan who brought down the lightning stroke that consumed the flocks and their shepherds; it was Satan who led the Chaldean plunderers to slay Job's servants and rob him of his camels; it was Satan who sent the whirlwind that buried Job's sons and daughters and their servants in the ruins of their dwelling; and in further trial of the saintly patriarch, it was Satan who smote Job with a grievous sore, "from the sole of his foot to his crown."

While, then, the evil wrought by Satan is

permissive only, yet we have here a disclosure of his methods and of his power.

He goes about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, his will and purpose neither approved nor sanctioned by the Almighty.

He is permitted to bring calamity and the severest possible trials upon the servants of God.

In this he has power to bring into his service the lightning, the whirlwind, disease, and the agency of wicked men, such as robbers and murderers.

While he exercises all this cruelty for the purpose of drawing the faithful from their allegiance, by inducing them to believe that God does not regard integrity, does not protect His servants, but leaves all things to chance; and that a moral chaos everywhere prevails, and that therefore the servants of God might as well curse Him as bless Him, thereby renouncing Him—while this is Satan's plan and purpose, and God permits him to shape all his dealings in accordance therewith (just as He permits depraved and abandoned men to plot and accomplish their hellish schemes), yet God has another and entirely opposite purpose, viz., the putting Job to the proof, and thus giving him occasion for still higher attain-

ments in piety; and in compensation for his sufferings to shower upon him far more abundant blessings.

Thus, while Satan has full sway—the limit being only Job's life—to do all of which his power and malignity are capable, yet he not only at the last stands defeated, but finds all his weapons turned upon himself. He has actually been made an instrument to bring about a triumph of righteousness. Instead of persuading Job to curse God because He has no care for him, Satan's very subtilty and malignity furnish opportunity to prove that God does care for His servants; that "He doth not afflict willingly or grieve the children of men," but makes the "light affliction which is but for a moment work a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Job could not see in this the hand and the face of a loving Father, for black was the cloud of sorrow around him; but not seeing he believed. The hand that had led him on in prosperous days he held still, walking on through the gloom with grasp as firm and heart as trusting as ever. He endured the test for we know not how many months and years, and those pious traits, all which had lain in his heart as seed before, now came forth in the full beauty and fragrance of maturity.

CHAPTER V.

ANGELI MALORUM AND SATAN'S FALSE PROPHETS AND LYING SPIRITS.

As we shall have frequent occasion to speak of Satan's angels or inferior demons or spirits, it is important that we distinguish these from those angels of God whom He sends forth as ministers of wrath and judgment.

The destroying angel who slew the first born in Egypt was God's angel sent forth on an errand of death. In Psalm lxxviii. 49, referring to the plagues of Egypt, the Psalmist says: "He cast upon them the fierceness of His anger, wrath, indignation, and trouble by sending evil angels among them." These were *Angeli Malorum*, or, as Ewald, Hitzig, Huppel, Delitzsch and Kalis render the verse, "even a mission of angels of misfortune."

So also the angel of the pestilence sent to inflict judgment on account of David's numbering the people (II. Sam. xxiv. 16, 17; I. Chron. xxi. 15, 16) was the angel of the Lord.

In Is. xxxvii. 36, we read that "the angel of

the Lord went forth and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and four score and five thousand."

In these examples their work indicated not the character of the angels, but their commission.

Again, Satan means adversary; but not every adversary is Satan. An "angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against Balaam, on his way to Balak." (Numb. xxii. 22.)

In the authorized version, as also in Luther's translation, there is evidently an error in Psalm cix. 6, "Set thou a wicked man over him and let Satan stand at his right hand." The marginal reading is "adversary." Verse 29 of the same Psalm correctly reads, "Let mine adversaries be clothed with shame."

A like instance is given in Zechariah iii. 1. The margin, for Satan, has "adversary"; and for resist, "be an adversary to." Ewald and Kohler read "an accuser" and "to accuse."

And he shewed me Joshua the high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him.

2. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen

Jerusalem, rebuke thee: *is* not this a brand plucked out of the fire?

3 Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel.

4 And he answered, and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.

5 And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the Lord stood by.

6 And the angel of the Lord protested unto Joshua, saying,

7 Thus saith the Lord of hosts, If thou wilt walk in my ways, and if thou wilt keep my charge, then thou shalt also judge my house, and shalt also keep my courts, and I will give thee places to walk among these that stand by.

8 Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, thou and thy fellows that sit before thee: for they *are* men wondered at: for behold, I will bring forth my servant The BRANCH.

9 For behold, the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone *shall be* seven eyes: behold, I will engrave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day.

10 In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, shall ye

call every man his neighbour under the vine, and under the fig-tree.*

It is a frequent peculiarity of Scripture language to impute to God, as done by Him, whatever He permits, or does not prevent. "Pharaoh's heart was hardened"; "Pharaoh hardened his heart"; and "the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh," all mean substantially the same thing.

II. Sam. xxiv. 1: "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He moved David against them to say, Gò, number Israel and Judah." Comparing this with I. Chron. xxi. 1, we read, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel."

* Oehler gives a satisfactory explanation of this chapter: "The High Priest is the representative of the people. He is accused before the Lord, not on account of his own sins as an individual, but in his capacity of High Priest. His priestly garments are defiled. Satan affirms that for this sinful people there is no valid mediation before God; that Israel is rejected because there is no longer an atonement for them. The Lord will however have pity, according to verse 2, on this brand plucked from the fire, the remnant of His people, and will not regard their sin. He therefore causes the High Priest to be clothed in clean garments, thus acknowledging the validity of the high-priestly mediation, though with an intimation, verse 8, that the perfect atonement for the people is to be effected only by the Messiah. Thus the work of Satan is to question the forgiveness, the justification of the Church, in which sense he is called, Rev. xii. 10, 'the accuser of our brethren.'"—*Old Testament Theology*, p. 450.

The sin was in David's heart. God was angry that he should cherish it. It is first suffered to ripen into an act. Satan is not restrained from tempting David. When the deed has been done the chastisement is inflicted and the sin is removed. God gives this hostile spirit "the power of using the guilty inclinations of man to cause him to fall." *

Ezekiel xiv. 4: "Thus saith the Lord God, Every man of the house of Israel that setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling block of his iniquity before his face and cometh to the prophet, I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols." Verse 9: "If the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing I the Lord have deceived that prophet."

This strong language simply emphasizes the fact that God permits—as a judgment upon the wicked—Satan to lead them astray. They forsake God, serve idols, and consult false prophets. When such persons, still retaining their idolatry, would consult a true prophet, their iniquity is a bar to their learning the truth. The prophet of God is not commissioned to give information to such.

In the Lord's Prayer we say, "Lead us not into temptation," while we know that God

* Oehler, p. 448.

never leads into temptation. The meaning is, Suffer us not to be led into temptation.

We have already seen that the evils which came upon Job were, one and all, Satan's work; that God's part in them was simply permissive. But we read, "An evil spirit from the Lord." Thus (I. Sam. xvi. 14), "The spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him," which simply proves that "a divinely permitted agency rules in the dominion of sin." An example of the same kind is found in Isaiah xix. 14, "The Lord hath mingled a perverse spirit in the midst thereof, and they have caused Egypt to err in every work thereof."

Turn now to I. Kings xxii. 19. Ahab would go against Ramoth-gilead. He consults the false prophets of Baal. They encourage him to go. But the king, at the instigation of Jehoshaphat, sends a messenger to Micaiah, a true prophet of the Lord, to know what answer he would give. The messenger begs Micaiah to give such reply as would please Ahab. In answer, therefore, to the king's question, "Shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear?" Micaiah repeated in mockery the very words of the false prophets, "Go and prosper, for the Lord hath delivered it into the hand of the king." Ahab

then puts the prophet upon his oath: "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true, in the name of the Lord?"

17 And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace.

18 And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee, that he would prophesy no good concerning me, but evil?

19 And he said, Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left.

20 And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner.

21 And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him.

22 And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade *him*, and prevail also: go forth, and do so.

23 Now therefore behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.

God had denounced certain judgments

against Ahab. Ahab was to be destroyed. But how? Not by a stroke from heaven, but by causes in the natural course of events. He is to be slain in battle. But he will not go to battle unless assured of victory. There are four hundred prophets of Baal, but only one prophet of the Lord. Ahab takes his choice. God permits a lying spirit to enter the prophets of Baal, and they, judging from former successes against the Syrians, prophesy victory. Thus Ahab's ruin is brought about through the instrumentality of the prophets of the false deity to whom he had apostatized from the living God.

Micaiah adopts the allegory as the form best suited to convey the truth, that when a man suffers his ambition or his passions or his self-conceit to blind his eyes to what, down in the depths of his soul, he knows to be true, God leaves him to his delusion and suffers the lying emissaries of Satan to pour into his ears smooth deceits, to charm and lull him, that he may hasten to the doom which awaits the apostate from God.

It is an assertion sometimes met in popular literature, in histories and encyclopedias, and made in that cool, matter-of-course manner, which implies that it never was and never could be questioned, that the Hebrew writers,

historians, and prophets knew nothing of such a personage as the devil until the Babylonian captivity, and that from that source it crept into their literature.

But the book of Job itself is a refutation of that assertion. That book, in which Satan is introduced as the agent of the calamities which befell that patriarch, was written before the captivity.

Again, the Chaldeans, to whose dominions the Jews were removed during the captivity, had no doctrine of evil spirits at all. Consequently, it could not have been derived from that source. But, it is asked, was not the Persian doctrine in the system of the Zend Avesta known to the Chaldeans? There is no evidence of this: but even if it were, the Hebrew idea of Satan is totally different. The Persian doctrine, which was that of Zoroaster, was two gods, Ormuzd the good and Ahriman the evil, each independent and of equal power. But Satan is not eternal, as Ahriman was supposed to be. Satan has no kingdom of darkness over which he presides with independent jurisdiction. Satan, as recognized in our Scriptures, is a fallen angel, who, though acting in opposition to God, is yet limited by the Almighty, and made to work out His plans and purposes. Just as God is not merely the

ideal and principle of goodness, holiness, perfection, power, and wisdom, but the impersonation of these attributes, so all that is evil is impersonated in Satan. This does not imply two gods, one good and the other evil, for Satan is not self-existent, and not a creator. Angels are created spirits possessed of great power and intellect. The fallen angels retain these endowments, but their goodness has been transformed into the opposite. Satan is their chief and leader. He is a being entirely different from any that the Hebrews learned of in their captivity.*

The attempt has been made to strengthen the hypothesis that the doctrine of Satan was borrowed, by the assertion that it finds no place in the earlier portions of Scripture (a date subsequent to the captivity being assigned to the book of Job); that the first conception of the Hebrews was that good and evil came alike from God; but as they became more enlightened it seemed preposterous to ascribe to the God of all goodness and mercy the wicked-

* Down to Zechariah iii. 3, the whole conception of Satan in its origin and significance is so purely Hebraistic that nothing can be more groundless and preposterous than to derive it from abroad. To suppose, as has been done of late, that a Persian origin of Satan is firmly established is entirely unhistorical and without foundation.—*Ewald, Lehre von Gott;* quoted by Oehler, p. 451.

ness in the world, and accordingly the evil principle was personified under the name of Satan or Devil. This theory is supposed to be confirmed by passages (some of which have already been considered in this chapter) which attribute acts to Satan which earlier writers have ascribed to Jehovah. But it is involved in certain difficulties. Sometimes the same writer attributes an act in one place to God and in another to Satan. Sometimes, both in the Old Testament and the New, God is represented by writers who are jealous for the righteousness of God, as avowing Himself to be the author of evil. The difficulty is not solved by saying that the early writers made one God the author of good and evil alike, while it was the later writers who attributed evil to Ahriman. For this peculiarity is found in the New Testament as well as in the later writers of the Old. Did Zechariah, when he says, viii. 9, "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Let your hands be strong," etc., etc., mean Jehovah, and yet, when in the very next verse he says, "I set all men, every man against his neighbor," mean Ahriman? Or, in the New Testament, is the Good Shepherd who giveth His life for the sheep one person, and he who came not to send peace on earth but a sword, and to set every man against his neighbor

another? In the Lord's Prayer, is Our Father one person and the power that leads into temptation another, even the evil one that we pray to be delivered from?

That Moses knew and acknowledged the existence of an evil spirit, a person, the author of sin, is evident from the account of the Fall which he gives in Gen. iii. Eve was tempted by a personal agent, a spirit who was in direct opposition to Jehovah.

The fact is, that throughout the Old Testament there is a development of doctrines in the line of clearer expression and additional instruction as the book advances. This is true of the doctrine of Satan as well as of others which became more fully unfolded as the worship of Jehovah was more firmly established.

CHAPTER VI.

DEVILS AND DEVIL-WORSHIP MENTIONED IN THE SCRIPTURES.

The Pentateuch is barren of any distinct doctrine concerning Satan. We are simply told that the serpent deceived our first parents. Later books of Scripture disclose who the tempter was that appeared in that form. But there is a marked, though somewhat obscure allusion to the source of evil in one of the most interesting of the rites and ceremonies ordained of God and written in the law of Moses,—I refer to the scapegoat.

Two male goats, in all respects equal, were to be brought before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle. On these lots were to be cast. The one indicated by the lot was to be sacrificed to the Lord. Upon the head of the other Aaron was to lay his hands and "confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man

into the wilderness." (Levit. xvi. 21.) But the words of the statute are (v. 8), "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one for the Lord, and one for the scapegoat." Our Bible renders the word "azazel," scapegoat. But the true meaning of that word does not seem to be satisfactorily determined. It is, however, agreed that it means something in opposition to the Lord—the evil one. The Jews understand that the goat ceremonially bore the sins of the people away to the source from whence they came—to the Devil.

In Leviticus xvii. 7, it is said that the people "shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils." In Deuteronomy xxxii. 17, Moses testifies of the people that they "sacrificed unto devils." Not only in the Pentateuch, but elsewhere, and generally in the Old Testament Scriptures, the divinities of the heathen are styled devils as they sometimes are in the New.

In many passages the heathen divinities are treated as mere nothings; as no gods at all, any more than the images that represent them. In fact, these false gods are generally identified with their images. Elijah the prophet ridicules and mocks Baal, and on Carmel demonstrates his practical nullity. (I. Kings xviii.) Isaiah, in the name of the Lord, challenges them to

do either good or ill. "Ye are of nothing, and your work of nought; an abomination is he that chooseth you." "Behold, they are all vanity; their works are nothing; their molten images are wind and confusion." (Is. xli. 23, 24, 29.) Their nullity is shown at length in xliv. 9–20. Also in xlvi. 5–7. Jeremiah x. 5, says of them, "Be not afraid of them, for they cannot do evil, neither is it also in them to do good." Ver. 8: "They are altogether foolish and brutish; the stock is a doctrine of vanities." Ver. 14: "The molten image is falsehood and there is no breath in them." In the same strain S. Paul says: "We know that an idol is nothing in the world." (I. Cor. viii. 4.)

The ancient heathen believed that the world was animated by a spirit, and was itself the habitation of the gods. These were supreme divinities, and were called natural gods.

Between the gods and men, however, they believed that there was an order of divinities whom they styled demons. To these were committed the control and dispensation of human affairs by the supreme deities, who did not concern themselves in mundane matters. These demons were worshipped and their favor sought, while gods of the highest order "were worshipped only with a pure mind or

with hymns and praises." According to Hierocles, these intermediate beings were known as angels, demons, or heroes. Plutarch teaches that, "according to divine nature and justice the souls of virtuous men are advanced to the rank of demons; and that from demons, if they are properly purified, they are exalted into gods." Strictly speaking, then, the demons were in their conception the departed spirits of heroes and other worthies, and to them were paid divine honors.

But there were bad demons as well as good. These, however, are never mentioned without the prefix *κακοῖ*. The heroes of the golden age were, after death, all good demons. The heroes of a more corrupt age became, some of them, *κακοῖ*. When spoken of collectively, without reference to the distinction between good and bad, they are all called demons.

The passages of Scripture which in our version state that the heathen worshipped devils, sacrificing their sons and daughters to them (Deut. xxxii. 17; Ps. xcv. 6; cvi. 37), have in the Septuagint *δαιμονίοις*. Josephus says of the objects of heathen worship, "Demons are the spirits of wicked men." (Bel. Jud. *lib.* vi. § 3.) S. Paul (I. Cor. x. 20, 21), speaking of the Gentiles sacrificing to devils, and of the cup of devils, uses the

same word *δαιμονίων*. When, however, the Hebrew had occasion to speak of the gods of the heathen, his word for them was *seirim*. Another word was *schedim*, in Greek *δαίμων*. But neither *seirim* nor *schedim* ever means the souls of the departed. One passage might seem to give countenance to the supposition that departed souls were meant. Ps. cvi. 28: "They sacrificed unto Baal Peor and ate the offerings of the dead." But of this Bishop Horne says, "This may mean no more than the sacrifices and offerings made to idols, who are properly termed dead in opposition to the true God, the Creator and Preserver of all things, who is in Scripture repeatedly and emphatically termed the *Living* God." Or it might mean that "they ate the offerings of those whom their worshippers confessed to be dead." Another passage is Deut. xxvi. 14. When, bringing the offering of the first fruits, the Israelite was to avow that of these he had, according to the law given to the Levite, to the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, and that he had not "taken away aught thereof for the dead." Of this the following interpretation is given by the prebendary of S. David's, the Rev. W. H. Davey, M.A., in the S. P. C. K. Commentary:

"A house of mourning, with all that was

concerned with the dead, was regarded as ceremonially unclean. (See Lev. xxi. 1–3, 11; Numb. xix. 11–22.)

"It was a pollution of hallowed things for an unclean person or thing to touch them or to employ them in connection with the dead; hence the reason for the prohibition in this passage. (1) Hallowed things were not to be partaken of by persons in an unclean condition; nor (2) were they to be appropriated to an unclean use; nor (3) employed in the preparation of food for mourners. The last words, 'nor given aught thereof for the dead,' are referred to the custom of sending provisions to a house of mourning for the use of mourners." (See Jer. xvi. 7, 8; Hos. ix. 4; Tobit iv. 17.)

When, therefore, the chosen people are charged with worshipping devils, it simply means that they worshipped and sacrificed to heathen divinities.

In II. Chron. xi. 15 it is said of Jeroboam that he "ordained him priests for the high places and for the devils and for the calves which he had made." This is supposed to refer to the goat worship or worship of Pan which Jeroboam had brought from Egypt. The same word, *seirim*, occurring in Is. xiii. 21, is translated in the authorized version satyrs.

Speaking of the desolations of Babylon, the prophet says, "Their houses shall be full of doleful creatures and owls shall dwell there and satyrs shall dance there."

In giving the word *seirim* the rendering satyrs, our translators doubtless had in mind the other interpretation of the word, viz., goat-footed demons. Bochartus derives the word satyr from the Hebrew *sair*, which he says signifies a devil under the form of a goat. All the ancient interpreters, Syriac, Arabic, Chaldee, and Jews understood the word as referring to demons who appeared in the shape of goats.*

Bishop Patrick says of these, that demons were accustomed to frequent the fields, and especially the deserts, representing themselves to ignorant persons as if they were gods, and enticing their devotion to themselves, "which demons, or evil spirits," he says, "appeared, it is likely, in the form of goats; and therefore are here called *seirim*, which properly signifies goats." According to Maimonides, the ancient Zabii worshipped these, and the extensive prevalence of this worship in Moses' time was the cause of the enactment against it.

The Talmudists represent the "screech-

* See Chapter XV., in which the word satyr is further considered.

owls" and "doleful creatures" as demons that lie in wait for children. Professor Day sets this down as a mere popular superstition. It very naturally suggests the inquiry whether popular superstition had not much to do with perpetuating in the minds of the people the idea that the goat-demon was a veritable divinity. Uninhabited woods and other desert places were supposed to be the favorite haunts of "doleful creatures," hairy and goat-footed demons, and the like. An ignorant, superstitious person traversing a lonely place and coming unexpectedly upon the hardly concealed form of a goat standing erect would not be very likely to tarry for a close inspection of the apparition. He would most probably make his way homeward as rapidly as possible, and communicate to astonished listeners the intelligence that he had seen a demon in a form resembling a goat. Repeated occurrences of the kind would probably strengthen the conviction. And, as the Talmudists and their predecessors were fully persuaded of the existence of these goat-demons, they interpreted the Scriptures accordingly.

But all this while Satan and his angels were actually spiritual powers of the dark kingdom opposed to the kingdom of God, and as such

industriously and at times most effectively using their powers in seducing the people of God from their allegiance; drawing them from the worship of God to the worship of devils.

CHAPTER VII.

DIVINERS, NECROMANCERS, ETC.

In Deuteronomy xviii. 9–12 are enumerated seven kinds of diviners, whom the Jews are forbidden to tolerate among them:

1. Those who used divination—who endeavored to penetrate futurity by auguries, casting lots and the like. 2. Observers of times—those who pretended to foretell future events by present occurrences; and who predicted political or physical changes from the aspects of the planets, eclipses, and the motions of the clouds. 3. Enchanters, either those who charmed serpents, or who drew auguries from inspecting the entrails and observing the flight of birds, and the like. 4. Witches, who pretended to bring down certain celestial influences to their aid, by means of herbs, drugs, and perfumes. 5. Charmers—those who used spells for divination. 6. Consulters with familiar spirits; or pythonesses, who pretended to inquire by means of one spirit to get oracular answers from another of a superior order.

7. Wizards, or necromancers — those who claimed to evoke the dead, in order to learn from them the secrets of the invisible world.*

What was the fact with regard to the several kinds of wonder-working here enumerated? That there was in them a vast deal of imposture is apparent from even a very limited examination of the subject. They were used for gain, or to impose upon credulity. But there is sufficient ground for asserting that there was also here the hand of Satan, working in the interests of his kingdom.

Moses and Aaron came before Pharaoh with a commission from the Almighty. They are met with the question, "Who is the Lord that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go." One feature of heathenism was a belief in local divinities. They supposed that each country had its own divinities, who were powerful there, but not in other lands. Pharaoh knew the gods of Egypt, but did not know the Lord; and therefore would not, at the demand of a foreign divinity, release Israel.

On their second appearance before Pharaoh, they, no doubt as fulfilling the command, "Speak thou unto Pharaoh, king of Egypt, all that I say unto thee," proclaimed the name of

* Horne's Introduction, Vol. II., p. 142.

Jehovah, as the Creator of heaven and earth, and therefore not a mere national divinity, but One to whom homage was due from the people of all the nations of the earth. Pharaoh demanded that, in attestation of this claim, a miracle be wrought. "And Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh and before his servants, and it became a serpent."

To this we can imagine Jannes and Jambres, the magicians of Pharaoh, asserting this is no miracle, but a magical deception, which we also can produce. Or they might have claimed, even if this be a miracle, it does not prove the God of the Hebrews greater than the divinities of Egypt. Accordingly the record reads, "The magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents." So far the powers of the two were apparently equal. "But Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods." This demonstrated that Aaron wrought by a power superior to theirs. If their marvel was magic, Aaron's was not. If they, by the power of Satan, wrought a veritable miracle, then the devouring of their rods by Aaron's proved that he and Moses were the ministers of one greater than the Devil. The same observations apply to the miracles of the blood and of the frogs.

But were the wonders displayed by the magicians of Pharaoh deceptions, or were they actual miracles produced by the spirit of evil?

One great object of this encounter was to vindicate the superiority of Jehovah to the divinities of Egypt. "Against the gods of Egypt will I execute judgment. I am the Lord." The supposition that the evil one should work miracles for his own purposes, and with a view to nullify the effect of the miracles wrought by divine power, is not only not without foundation, but is sustained by Scripture itself. "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." (Deut. xiii. 1–3.)

It is well known that thaumaturgists in Egypt and in India to-day lay claim to like powers. What ground there may be for giving credit to these will be considered in another chapter. Suffice it to remark here that such prodigies were seen and subjected to the se-

verest tests by French savans in Egypt, and pronounced utterly inexplicable. Similar tests have been applied to the feats of the fakirs in India.*

Our Saviour prophesied that before His coming "many false prophets shall arise and deceive many." "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." (Matt. xxiv. 11, 24.) Here is a description of the anti-Christ of the last days: "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders." (II. Thess. ii. 9.) "And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by means of those miracles which he had power to do." (Rev. xiii. 13, 14.)

* "Taking into consideration all which we know about these magicians, that they do, and apparently have always constituted an hereditary guild, that the charmer throws himself into an ecstatic state, the question remains how far there may be here a wreck and surviving fragment of a mightier system, how far the charmers do not even now, consciously or unconsciously, bring themselves into relation with those evil powers which more or less remotely do at the last underlie every form of heathen superstition. On this matter Hengstenberg (*Die Bucher Mose's und Ægypten, pp.* 97–103) has much of interesting matter."—*Trench on Miracles,* p. 26.

We come now to that weird scene, the interview of King Saul with the woman commonly known as the Witch of Endor. This woman is not in Scripture styled a witch, but a woman that hath a familiar spirit. She was a diviner, by means of necromancy, or consultation with the dead. The exact translation is "a woman, a mistress of Ob." It is remarkable to observe that this word "Ob" corresponds with the African word "Obi," which is the designation of a similar species of sorcery practiced among the negroes to this very day.

At the time of the translation of our Bible the popular idea of a witch was derived entirely from a pagan ancestry. It was that of a female who, by charms and incantations, held converse with evil spirits, and by the aid of Satan could appear or vanish, and bring mischief, disease, or torments upon people. There was nothing corresponding to this in the Hebrew Scriptures. When, therefore, our translators placed the word "witch" in the English version, the people very naturally supposed that the popular idea of witches was sanctioned by Scripture. To this error is largely attributable that dark and bloody drama which was enacted in the days of witchcraft.

Saul, in his pride and wilfulness, had disobeyed; and, given over to his hardness of heart, pursued a career of opposition to the will of the Almighty. The Spirit of the Lord had departed from him, and an evil spirit had taken possession. His own subjects were alienated; and now, his army as dispirited as himself, faced in all the gloom of despair the hosts of the Philistines. The record reads:

5 And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled.

6 And when Saul enquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets.

7 Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and enquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, *there is* a woman that hath a familiar spirit at En-dor.

8 And Saul disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night; and he said, I pray thee, divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me *him* up whom I shall name unto thee.

9 And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore then layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?

10 And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, *As*

the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing.

11 Then said the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said, Bring me up Samuel.

12 And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou *art* Saul.

13 And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth.

14 And he said unto her, What form *is* he of? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he *is* covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it *was* Samuel, and he stooped with *his* face to the ground, and bowed himself.

15 And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do.

16 Then said Samuel, Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy?

17 And the Lord hath done to him, as he spake by me: for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbour, *even* to David:

18 Because thou obeyedst not the voice of the

Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day.

19 Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee, into the hand of the Philistines: and to-morrow *shalt* thou and thy sons *be* with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines.

20 Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel, and there was no strength in him: for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night.

Of course, a transaction so mysterious could hardly fail to elicit a variety of theories in the way of explanation. But among the several views entertained it is safest to choose that one which comes nearest to the words of the record, and is most consistent with the general tone of Scripture.

Consequently, the theory that the whole scene was the result of collusion between the attendants of Saul and the sorceress is rejected. Such could not possibly have been the conviction of the inspired writer of the narrative.

Nor could it have been, according to another view, that this was "a divine representation or impression, partly upon the senses of Saul, and partly upon those of the woman, and intended for the rebuke and punishment of Saul."

This is simply an effort to divest the story of one miracle by gratuitously supposing another.*

The accepted opinion of both the early Jewish and Christian writers is this: Whether the woman was an impostor, or actually possessed the power of holding intercourse with the dead—which is expressly stated to be one of the abominations for which God drove out the nations of Canaan—however that may have been, when the woman put forth her effort, expecting, if honest, to receive a communication from a departed spirit in reply, the hand of God interposed, and from the earth arose the mantled form of the prophet Samuel, surprising her as well as her royal visitor.

There is not in the whole narrative any intimation that the appearance of Samuel was either a deception or an optical illusion. That it was the accepted opinion that the appearance was real is evident from Josephus, and from the fact that Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Typho the Jew, appeals to it as proof of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

An allusion to arts of the same kind as those practiced by the woman of Endor is found in Isaiah viii. 19, 20: "And when they shall say

* Kitto's "Biblical Encyclopedia," art. "Witchcraft." The writer of that article adopts this theory from Farmer.

unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Professor Briggs, in his work on "Messianic Prophecy" (p. 38), translates verse 19 as follows:

"When they say unto you seek unto the necromancers and unto the wizards;—

"Ye chirpers and mutterers, should not a people seek unto their God?

"On behalf of the living will they seek unto the dead for instruction and for testimony?"

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS AND THE DEMONIACAL POSSESSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

At the time of the coming of our Saviour the malice of Satan was aroused to the utmost, and all the power he was capable of wielding was exerted to defeat the mission of Christ. He had dealt with the first Adam, and had achieved an easy victory. He now had to measure weapons with the Second Adam, the second head of the race, who had come with the avowed purpose of destroying him. He had not shrunk from defying the Almighty, and raising against Him the arm of rebellion, nor would he now shrink from engaging in a death contest with the Son of God, who came with the very object of wresting from him his stronghold and his spoils, and loading him with eternal chains.

The narrative of the temptation in the wilderness is full of difficulties. Whether the

transfer of scene was by bodily conveyance or vision, the temptation itself was a reality.

It seems a preposterous thing that Satan should tempt the Son of God at all, or think Him capable of yielding to the solicitations of the Devil. But as Satan's power is limited, so that he cannot pass a hair's breadth beyond the bounds prescribed by the Almighty, so is his knowledge limited.

It was a theory of some of the ancient Fathers that Satan did not know, any more than the Jews knew, whence and how the Messiah was to come. He must have known that He was expected about that time. He knew that the Christ was to be a descendant of David, and that He was to be born in Bethlehem. But to Satan as to the Jews there were no indications of these credentials of the Messiah in the person of Jesus. When, then, at the call of John the Baptist from the banks of Jordan, Jerusalem and all Judea had flocked to his baptism, and there came a poor carpenter of Nazareth, Satan was amazed and confounded to hear that voice, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Tracking his footsteps from Jordan to the wilderness, he beheld Him here prepare for His ministry by the meditations and prayers and fastings of forty days.

Was this one, then, indeed the Messiah? this the Restorer of Paradise? this He who was to overcome death? this the Mighty One who was to conquer even Satan himself? The adversary waited until this meek and lowly man should become weakened by fast to the very limits of human exhaustion, and then began his assault. And now mark how each temptation begins with the expressed purpose of ascertaining whether or no this man of humble circumstance were indeed the Son of God. "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread"; "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down"; "If thou be the Son of God, fall down and worship"; all going to show that Satan was not sure as to the character of the person with whom he had to deal.

Another point to be observed is that, in conducting this attack, Satan could not have appeared in his real character. He never does, in any temptation. He is too crafty to suppose that any one can be lured into sin by one appearing in all the hideousness of a monster. Not by sin in its native blackness and deformity are men lured into evil; and that is a ridiculous caricature which in Bible illustrations and pictures for the young represents this scene as a parley between our Lord and a

fantastic, ugly character with horns and hoofs. If he appeared in visible form at all it was as an angel of light, of transcendent beauty, and speaking the language of heaven.

But some writers contend that it is not necessary to the truth of the narrative to suppose that he was visible at all. The record is that Jesus went up into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil; and as our Lord was tempted in all points like as we are, so it may not be necessary to suppose Satan approaching Him in any manner different from that he adopts when he would lure us aside from the right. And this he does by suggesting thoughts to our minds; not by appearing personally in any form whatever, to urge his plea.

Satan did not know that in Jesus dwelt "all the fulness of the godhead bodily"; but our Lord knew Satan as the tempter; and He recognized him by the character of the temptation—just as we recognize Satan, not by any outward appearance, not always even by the apparent depravity of the suggestion, but by the real character of the thought when stripped of its plausible seeming. And it is just here where the lesson of the temptation in the wilderness meets us in its practical application. When that serpent of old tempted Eve, there

was not a thing he asked her to do that did not wear the appearance of what was good and truly desirable in itself. And every temptation with which our Lord was assaulted wore a specious guise.

It is said by S. Luke that, "when the Devil had ended all the temptation he departed from Him for a season." Of course, if Jesus was tempted in all points like as we are, the assaults of the adversary were unceasing. But there is a passage in our Lord's history which would seem to indicate that these words, "departed from Him for a season," had a special reference.

Our Lord had begun to open to the disciples the awful scenes that were before them. He was to go up to Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and rise again the third day. "Then Peter took Him and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But He turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan," the very words He had used to the adversary in the wilderness—"Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savorest not the things of God, but those that are of men." Peter had unwittingly acted as the mouth-piece of Satan, repeating one, and

that the strongest temptation—to make conquest of the world, not by laying down His life for its sins, but by repudiating all the heaven-appointed means—savoring not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

One of the proofs which Jesus offered His adversaries of the divinity of His mission was that by the power of God He cast out devils. "If Satan be divided against himself, how can his kingdom stand? But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come among you." This was a prominent feature of His ministry. Among the cures He wrought, a large number were those of possessions of devils. He sent out His seventy disciples two by two, and a part of their mission was to cast out devils. They returned from their circuit, exulting, "Lord, even the very devils are subject unto us through thy name."

It has been maintained by some that the superstition of the Jews in our Saviour's time prompted them to ascribe to the agency of Satan maladies which were due entirely to natural causes; and that such were the afflictions called in the New Testament possessions of the Devil. When such commentators are reminded that the fact of such possessions is recognized not only by the inspired writers of

the Gospels, but even by the Saviour Himself, it is replied that our Lord and His disciples simply adopted the popular phraseology, without at all meaning to be understood as sanctioning the popular superstition. Just as we use the word "lunatic" for "insane," when the real meaning of lunatic is "one affected by the moon"; it having once been supposed that to the influence of the moon the cause of mental disorders was due.* But the language of our Lord implies more than this, as will appear by examining the record of these miracles.

Take the case of the man in the country of the Gadarenes. The Evangelist describes him as "a man having an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him—no, not with chains; because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces, neither could any man tame him. And always, night and day, he was in the mountains and in the tombs, crying and cutting himself with stones." This was the condition of Satan's unhappy victim. "A severe case of lunacy," it is said. But if so, then it is most remarkable that he should possess a degree of discernment beyond that of all his countrymen;

* See Trench on the Miracle at Gadara.

for he addressed Jesus as the Son of the Most High God. And it is the cry not of a pitiable lunatic standing before his deliverer, but more like a shrieking demon cowering before his avenger—"What have I to do with thee Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I adjure thee by God that thou torment me not."

Now I ask, can one imagine it possible for Jesus, a man of truth—who could say of Himself to Pilate, "For this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto the truth"—for such a person to lend himself to upholding a superstition of the Jews, by not only accepting their belief in demons, but actually addressing the demon himself, when there was no demon there? For Jesus said to the devil within his victim, "Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit." Not only so, but he asked, "What is thy name?" And the Evangelist represents the demon as replying, "My name is Legion, for we are many."

There was a herd of swine feeding near by, "and all the devils besought Him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them." Did the inspired writer of this account, S. Mark, believe that this was merely a case of lunacy? Could he have used such language, knowing all the while that there was no demon there? Hear him further: "And

forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea (they were about two thousand), and were choked in the sea." The man remained, for we find him shortly afterwards sitting at Jesus' feet, clothed and in his right mind. Was it, then, a lunacy that left the man and entered the herd of swine? Or was not the Evangelist an honest penman when he wrote, "The unclean spirits went out and entered into the herd of swine?"

Furthermore, when this man was restored and would have followed Jesus, he is told to go and tell what great things God had done for him. In other words, he was expressly charged to go about and relate the occurrence which had just taken place—which would have been spreading a falsehood, unless he had been possessed of demons, and unless our Lord had actually cast them out.

But the belief which the inspired writers themselves firmly entertained, and in which they were confirmed by the words and conduct of the Saviour, is apparent from other records of demoniacal possessions. They did not confound these with lunacy. For, says S. Matthew, "they brought unto Him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and tor-

ments and those that were possessed with devils and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy, and he healed them" (iv. 24). The same distinction is made by S. Mark (iii. 14, 15), where the Lord sent forth the twelve "to preach and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils." In vi. 7, He "began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits." In the same chapter it is said of these same disciples (ver. 13), that "they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." S. Luke (vi. 17, 18) speaks of a great multitude of people "which came to hear Him and to be healed of their diseases, and they that were vexed with unclean spirits." The distinction between demoniacal possessions and various diseases is clearly recognized by S. Matthew (x. 1): "When He had called unto Him His twelve disciples He gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease;" and by our Lord Himself in His charge to the disciples (ver. 8): "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils."

I have spoken of the mission of our Lord as an actual conflict with Satan; and just as, with scourge in hand, He drove the unhal-

lowed traders from the temple, so, in the Evangelists' vivid descriptions, we can almost see Him lashing the demons from the bodies of their victims and bidding them "Avaunt! to your dwelling place in hell."

Into a synagogue at Capernaum, where Jesus was teaching on the Sabbath day, there came one who is described as being possessed of an unclean devil. He also addressed the Saviour —*i.e.*, the demons taking possession of his organs of speech, cried out: "Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us? And Jesus rebuked"—whom? the man? no, but the spirit that tortured him,—"saying, Hold thy peace and come out of him."

But there are cases of demonical possessions which of their very nature do not admit of being taken for lunacy. S. Matthew (xii. 22) describes one possessed of a devil, who was dumb and blind. In S. Luke (xi. 14.) one possessed of a devil was dumb. In each case it is recorded that Jesus cast out the devil, thereby showing that the Evangelists understood these to be demoniacal possessions, and that our Lord Himself so regarded them. Not only so, but so thoroughly satisfied were the people and His enemies, the Pharisees, that these were Satanic possessions, that they im-

mediately accused Jesus of casting out devils through a compact with Beelzebub, the prince or chief of the devils.

Yet again, the Syro-Phenician woman said to Jesus (Matt. xv. 22), "My daughter is grievously vexed with a devil." And when at length He granted her request, His words were (Mark vii. 29), "The devil is gone out of thy daughter."

When our Lord had gone up into the Mount of Transfiguration, there came to the disciples a father whose child was afflicted with a malady, in the description of which there are demoniacal possession and lunacy and epilepsy. The cure wrought by the Heavenly Physician is thus stated (Mark ix. 25): "He rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee come out of him and enter no more into him." The narrative proceeds: "And the spirit cried and rent him sore, and came out of him" (ver. 26). The disciples then ask, "Why could not we cast him out?" (ver. 28.)

Now, suppose a physician treating cases of insanity; and because that malady is known by the term lunacy—or moon stroke—to advise his patient with reference to the beams of the moon; or to solemnly adjure the moon, charging it to cease its influence upon the

patient. But one of two conclusions could be drawn: either that physician is speaking and acting a lie, or he really believes that insanity is a disease caused by the moon. Applying the same rule to the language of the Evangelists and the words and conduct of our Lord, and there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that the New Testament distinctly teaches the reality of demoniacal possessions.

In his "History of the Supernatural," Howitt makes the following quotation from Horst in his "Zauber Bibliothek":

"It is in vain to attempt to clear away from these Gospel narratives the Devil and his demons. Such an exegesis is opposed to the whole faith of the world at that time. If we are to make these statements now mean just what we please, why did no single man in the ancient world understand them so? Are we become wiser? Then let us congratulate ourselves on our good fortune: but we cannot, on that account, compel those venerable writers to say what they in their own time neither could nor would say."

But it is said, if such were the cases mentioned in the New Testament, how comes it that this malady was not extended to other nations besides the Jews? The reply is that such possessions were recognized among the

heathen. It was not in Judea, but in Philippi, a Roman colony in Macedonia, that Paul and Silas were annoyed by a damsel who was possessed with a spirit of divination. The record is that "Paul turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out of her the same hour." (Acts xvi. 18.) And further, "heathen authors allude to possession by a *demon* (or by a *god;* for they used the two words with little or no distinction) as a thing of no uncommon occurrence." *

There was, in those demoniacal possessions recorded in Scripture, something that is more than sad and pitiable. There was that which is truly appalling. We have read these stories from our childhood, and have become so familiar with the narratives that we fail to realize all that they imply. To think of what a revelation they give of Satan himself and his character! A fallen angel, the leader of the host that rebelled against the Almighty; who, cast out of heaven, transferred the scene of battle to this our world; boldly seized upon this globe for his dominion, and enlisted man in his service. And nothing but the mighty arm of the "Seed of the Woman" who was born to 'bruise the serpent's head"—nothing

* Abp. Whately on "Angels," p. 103.

but this has held him back from making every hill and valley of our earth precisely like those dark and fiery depths where revel the demons of hell. This he would have done, but could not, for the Seed of the Woman has bruised the serpent's head. But the same first prophecy declared that the serpent should bruise the heel of the Seed of the Woman. And from Adam on, every child of man has felt the sting of the serpent's fangs. We understand what it is to be wounded in our moral nature, and how through our natural infirmities sin enters. But in those possessions mentioned in Scripture demons seized upon the bodies and the intellects of men. They were not cases where Satan finds willing victims, glad to come under the power of sin, and whom he leads on step by step in easy and almost imperceptible digressions until at length they awaken to the consciousness that they are absolutely helpless in his grasp and powerless to return—the web of the monster woven securely around them, and they struggling, but lost.

The subjects of those diabolical possessions were not cases of this description. They do not by any means appear to have been persons who, by a persistent career in wickedness or by some act of fearful depravity, threw themselves into the embrace of Satan. They

seem to have been victims innocent as they were helpless. The traveller Livingstone has told us what may be seen in secluded spots in the wilds and jungles of Africa. There is a spring of water, and the deer come to drink; but hidden beneath the dense foliage there lies coiled a huge monster. A serpent, a hundred feet in length, suddenly darts from his concealment, and in an instant wraps the helpless victim in his folds. So Satan, without any other allurement than to find a prey for his hellish malignity, falls upon whom he can.

The person so seized is conscious of his condition. He struggles and gasps his cry for help. He is conscious that another power than himself has the mastery; that his movements are guided by a will not his own—the will of a person, and that person a spirit absolutely and essentially evil—compelling him to do deeds of vileness and speak words of uncleanness and blasphemy, and then goading to frenzy amidst unutterable tortures of mind and body.

This was the work of Satan, who in the days of Jesus and His Apostles proved himself to be the strong man armed, keeping his palace and his goods in security. But our Lord, in casting out devils demonstrated to the children of that generation that a stronger than Satan

had now come to wrest from him his dominion and his spoils.

Let us thank God that the fearful scenes of that day have passed into history. They were no unmeaning words—those of our Lord to the seventy on their return from their mission —"I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven." The wound was inflicted. The adversary's power was crippled, and those bodily possessions of Satan became more rare, insomuch that many of the learned and pious now declare that they have wholly ceased. But others equally pious and learned, though holding that they may not pass entirely away until the end of the world, yet admit that they are of rare occurrence now; so seldom witnessed that people in general seem unconscious of their presence at all.*

* Appendix B.

CHAPTER IX.

THE EVIL OVERRULED.

Some things are what they are in their very nature, and cannot possibly be otherwise. Two and two make four. To ask if any other result is possible is not at all a question of power, it is a question of the very nature of numbers. An opaque substance intercepting light creates a shadow. This cannot possibly be otherwise. It is true in the very nature of things. If there be no shadow, then the substance is not opaque. This may serve as an illustration of the consequence of sin. Death is that dark shadow, the consequence—necessary in the very nature of things—of sin obscuring the light of God. And by death I here mean what Scripture often means by the same word,—all the ills that come upon man in this life and in the life to come.

Satan, the enemy, brought sin into the world and all its sad consequences. God is omnipotent; but that does not affect the fact that "the wages of sin is death." To suppose sin

without its consequences is as absurd as to suppose the intercepting of the rays of light without producing a shadow.

It has been said, "If God is omnipotent, He can prevent evil. If He is good, He will do so." But the existence of evil as the consequence of the entrance of sin into the world is not a question affecting either God's power or goodness. It exists in the very nature of things.

But are we then for one moment to suppose that the author of sin brought upon this creation woes which both the divine omnipotence and the divine goodness are powerless to prevent? Let us pursue the subject reverently.

We can suppose the two attributes of omnipotence and benevolence to unite in one of two courses:

I. To annihilate this race of man and all that is on our globe, renew the whole face of creation and place a sinless pair again in Eden; at the same time annihilate Satan and his legions, so that there should be no temptation; and thus make sin impossible.

But a sinless pair in Eden without the power to sin would make man's service of God cease to be a voluntary service. Man, if holy, would be so not because he chose to be, but because, like a machine, compelled to be: holy, not as

a matter of impulse, not of reason, not of choice. To exercise the attributes of omnipotence and benevolence in this manner was not according to the dictates of the divine wisdom.

II. But another course might be pursued. Evil, with all its sorrow, pain, misery, and death, might be permitted, but at the same time made to subserve the cause of good—of man's happiness and highest welfare. This is the course which the divine wisdom did see fit to adopt.

This is the dispensation under which we live: a world of sin, pain, sorrow, suffering, but not a pang nor a calamity which may not promote the greater good of the afflicted and the honor of God.

Suffering, in some greater or less degrees of discomfort, is everywhere; and this, to short-sighted mortals impugns the wisdom and goodness of God. But the very ones who thus complain, owe all they know and all the good they have achieved to the pains and discomforts which they themselves have personally endured, or which they know to be part of the system of the world. Touch the fire and you feel the pain. But you have thus learned a lesson which will keep you ever afterward from exposing to destruction the tissues of the body. So also the blow upon the flesh, the bruise,

the gash of the knife; every discomfort of the kind teaches one how to avoid that which would be perilous to his well-being. This is part of our education; as much as the tasks of school, some of which may be painful, some by right conduct may be avoided; some, rightly understood, may become a pleasure; and all prepare us for the duties and successes of manhood or womanhood.

Even those discomforts, the benefits of which in a personal application we cannot see, still have their beneficent purpose in the progress of civilization and the welfare of the community. What has brought the skill of the physician and the surgeon to its present degree of attainment but the prevalence of disease and the disasters of accident? A story of constant hardship is the history of the progress of science. True, the pleasures of knowledge have beckoned the student on, but discomfort and necessity have compelled the search. The hope of reward sweetens labor; but the pangs of poverty are a lash that hangs over the toiler's head to compel him to work, and thus save him from the life of the vagabond. The discomforts of old systems compel men to seek the new; and to these very discomforts we owe the triumphs of the railway, of steam and electricity.

The very ones who complain of the miseries of life, and, arguing from them, actually presume to call in question the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, do thus disclose what kind of life they deem worthy of man—a life that degrades manhood. If a life of mere animal gratification, of the pleasures of dissipation, of luxurious ease and indolence, of swinish greed or pompous display—if either of these is a worthy life for man, then I grant that this world is not wisely made or ordered. For the drunkard and the debauchee cannot be happy in this world of ours. The indulgence of luxury and indolence brings the shriekings of pain or the feebleness of lassitude. Ambition brings its perils and woes, and is dashed to a destruction terrible according to the height from which it falls. Avarice and envy also—all these bring remorse of conscience and pangs that are but a foretaste of what is in store in the life to come.

And now, though what has been said does not cover all the kinds and degrees of unhappiness, yet sufficient has been stated to show that it would be well for many of the discontented and murmuring seriously to ask themselves if the cause of their complaining may not be due in great measure to their ideal of life and the use they propose to make of this

world. They conceive an ideal of what they would have and enjoy, and at once set about attaining it. That ideal may be a life of vanity and display, of securing a certain conspicuous position for themselves and their children. Their whole conception of what is desirable may not rise above what is frivolous. This would indeed be a most frivolous world, a world unworthy of its Maker if it were not full of humblings and castings down of the pride of the aspirants of such a life.

The ideal of many, if not frivolous, may be in other respects unworthy or unsuitable, so that it is well for them that a wisdom higher than their own planned the course and constitution of the world.

But if evil,—including in that word all the ills and sorrows of life—if evil does serve such beneficent purposes, how can we ascribe it to Satan? Is he then turned benefactor? Not so. But God, instead of annihilating Satan and rendering evil impossible by destroying man's free agency, has suffered Satan to go on; has permitted men freely to choose between good and ill (and to abide the consequences of their choice), and then so overruled all as to bring about a greater good. God, while permitting evil to exist, has actually incorporated it as an element into the moral

constitution and government of the world! There are certain benefits to the individual and to society, which, as the world is now constituted, could not, so far as we can see, be attained without the existence of evil. I go further, and state that some of the most desirable results for society and some of the greatest and most important events in the history of the world could not have been accomplished without the agency of wicked men. So that sin, and suffering—the consequence of sin—and wicked men and their wicked deeds have been brought to do effective service in the cause of God. He has actually made Satan's a kingdom divided against itself. Every weapon the adversary has forged is turned against himself.

Of this a striking illustration is given by the prophet Isaiah, where the wrath of man which worketh not the righteousness of God is made to praise Him (Is. x. 5–7): "O Assyrian! the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in

his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few."

Even the common ailments of life, which the righteous suffer as well as the wicked, and which—though the inherited consequence of sin—are not to be ascribed to the transgressions of the sufferer, even these become, to those who receive them aright, promotive of the growth of the spiritual life.

The Conqueror of Satan overcame death, not by causing that man should not die, but by granting him after death a resurrection to life—making the very grave the threshold of immortality; just as He triumphs over sin and its effects by making suffering the nursery of the Christian graces and the school of the highest possible spiritual attainment. So also He compels men in the worst and most infamous deeds of their wickedness to further the cause of God; harnessing the very steeds of Satan to the triumphal car of the Messiah.

That most heinous crime, in which seemed concentrated all the wickedness of which the race was capable—the nailing of Jesus—God Incarnate—to the cross—so far as we can see, nothing but wickedness could possibly have accomplished it. And yet thereby was attained the redemption of the world. It was the greatest possible triumph of Satan; yet it

was the breaking of his power, and wresting the world from his dominion. He who had brought sin, woe, pain, suffering, death into the world, saw his own artillery seized by the Victor and turned upon himself; and the Easter sun dawned upon a world where God was triumphant and Satan dethroned.

CHAPTER X.

SPIRITUAL INFLUENCES, GOOD AND EVIL.

Looking within our own hearts, we cannot but be conscious of an influence which is so far not of ourselves that it passes judgment upon our acts, our wishes, our thoughts; and, independently of our wills, approves or condemns. It is our moral sense, our conscience.

On the other hand there is an influence to wrong. Appetite, passion, self-love, born in us and designed for good, yet do exert a most powerful influence to draw us away from what is right and holy. This could not be were not ours a nature fallen from that in which Adam was created. In each and every person, then, are these two opposite forces. There is a constant struggle and contest between them. But there are still other influences.

Any intelligent idea of religion at all implies a belief in the being and influence of the Third Person in the Godhead, the Holy Ghost: a belief that He enlightens the mind as to duty;

that He suggests holy thoughts and purposes; and that He imparts strength.

These operations of the Spirit are upon the person of the believer, as he is, with the mental and bodily endowments peculiar to him—his intellect, his will, affections, mind, soul and spirit. All this is implied in any intelligent conception of the Christian religion.

A person then is capable of being enlightened, guided, and strengthened by a spiritual influence coming from some Being who is not himself.

A person is in like manner subject to impressions from a spirit of evil as well as from a spirit of good. Between these two opposing forces our pathway lies. Here are two masters. One or the other will hold dominion over us. "To whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or obedience unto righteousness."

Every sin is of the Devil, and is the result of his taking advantage of our natural weaknesses to lead us astray from God. It is his method to seize upon each person's peculiar constitutional or other weakness, which supplies a substratum of infirmity, giving Satan a hold upon us, and through which he too often draws us into his toils.

But, says S. James, "Every man sins when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." The lust is there. It is the man's own. Whether of pleasure, appetite, or greed, it is the heritage of our fallen nature, and inclines, draws us away toward evil. Satan lures, entices, and we sin. The Spirit of God is by, warning, calling, and offering help. But as Satan has no power to draw us away without the consent of our wills, so also the Holy Ghost has imposed upon Himself a law according to which He cannot draw us to holiness if our wills oppose.

When, then, according to S. James, "every man sins when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed," it no more denies the presence of a tempter than when we say of a person that he sins. The appetite or greed or lust is there, Satan entices, the will consents, and the sin is committed.

But to show more clearly the nature of these two masteries, which obtain and hold their lordship by the willing obedience that is yielded to them. There are certain deeds of evil of which it may be said that you cannot do them. They are what would be called a moral impossibility. There are depths of depravity so revolting and inhuman that you could not sink to them. And yet you possess

the same human nature which is to be found among the most debased and abandoned. The difference between you and them is simply this: they have yielded themselves willing servants of Satan, and he has led them on. Each deed of iniquity which he required of them they have voluntarily done, until at last there is no deed so black and vile that they shrink from committing. You could not do the deeds, because, even if you have at times sinned—if Satan has sometimes led you astray, it has been against your convictions. You have put forth at least some resistance to the wrong. You have yielded, too readily it may be; but you have acknowledged and felt the wrong, repented and sought the aid of the Spirit of God. But you have the same human nature that the worst have, and you have but to yield yourself as they do to become what they are.

But there are other things which it may be said that you cannot do. Call to mind the names of saintly ones in Scripture record—Paul and Barnabas, Peter and James and John, and the whole army of martyrs and confessors—of whom the world was not worthy, but who yet have found followers in all the ages of the Church. Their utter abnegation of self and the world, devoting lives to hard-

ship and suffering, to imprisonment, torture, and death—how many, professing and calling themselves Christians, could, if summoned to-day, take up the cross and walk in such footsteps?

It was because the Spirit of God possessed them, because they were filled with the Holy Ghost that they were thus enabled. And just as surely as they who yield willing obedience to Satan to do with alacrity his bidding become at length effectually so seized and possessed, and under his power as to do what they who are guided by the Spirit of God could not do,—even so the willingly yielding to that Divine Spirit, the seconding with alacrity His motions, the rendering to Him an entire and hearty obedience, is to be led along on a pathway of light, shining brighter and holier as the life goes on, until body, soul, and spirit, pure and sanctified, are presented to God.

Let us follow out this idea of willing obedience and service on the one hand, and dominion and mastery on the other.

What would be thought of one who would knowingly and deliberately make a bargain, and for the price of some fancied gratification throw away his health—expose himself to the consumption, to gangrene and rottenness; run

a career of disgrace to himself and dishonor to his friends and kindred, loathed by acquaintances, and that too while he has talents and opportunities for fame and fortune, or whatever else may be deemed desirable? Perhaps he has a family. Some estimable woman who loved him has given him her trust, her heart and hand, and become the mother of his children. He neglects them; leaves them to rags and poverty and want and dishonor—the wretch all the while protesting his love for them. And as for God, he believes indeed as the devils do, and trembles. And yet this one, knowing what he is doing, knowing what the end must be, beyond all hope of rescue—knowing it all, yet with jovial shouts and ringing laughter, goes on to the horrors of a hell on earth, the brink of a darker and a bottomless hell of the undying worm and the unquenchable flame.

It is not necessary to ask is it possible to reconcile such a course with reason, conscience, honor, humanity, or even a decent regard for any of the virtues? There can be but one answer to that question.

But how are we to account for the possibility of such a life in one born with faculties in a normal condition, and surrounded by the ordinary inducements of honor, virtue, and

common decency—every consideration, which in common view makes life worth living, thrown away—the sole inducement being a purely animal pleasure—the gratifying of a craving? It is as though some huge serpent were to approach a man and say, "I will pledge you a most pleasing sensation if you will but permit me to wind myself in coils around you!"

If impossible to be reconciled with reason, is it insanity? Try him. In sober moments his faculties all are clear. Even his moral sense is not obscured. He can act and converse and work with ordinary wisdom and skill, and you cannot make more plain to him than his conscience already does—flashing its light along his pathway—the way whereto his footsteps lead, to the region of outer darkness, of wailing and gnashing of teeth. Now this is not insanity. Indulgence may from time to time produce a temporary madness, but this is not the act of an insane person. It is one in his sober senses voluntarily choosing the excitement of a delirium.

But if not insanity, what is it? Some will say it is a disease. Leaving the question of disease where it belongs, let us consider it so far only as it bears upon the particular point before us. There are diseases that yield to

mind cure and will cure. And surely one would think that among these may be classed those which could not exist without the co-operation of the mind and will.*

Here is a test. In the very height of his craving, go and place before him the intoxicating draught, and just as he reaches out to grasp it, pour out in his sight, into the bowl, a poison which he knows to be instant death. Will he drink? No. A proper sense of self-preservation then restrains him. What then would a larger and truer sense, a deeper realization of what is a living death of shame, dishonor, disgrace, inhumanity, beastliness, and a darker death beyond—what would a realizing sense of this (which a pure faith implies) be but a perfect and most effectual remedy?

We are not disposed to dismiss this in such a manner as to invite the criticism, "O, it is easy to underestimate. But there is, notwithstanding, a force which none save they who

* Statements of eminent physicians, that alcohol by excessive use affects the digestive organs and the brain are not here called in question. That such deleterious effects may cause an intense craving for stimulants is not denied. But neither must they who style alcoholism or dipsomania a disease call in question the fact established by abundant testimony, that it is a disorder of that kind which "goeth out by prayer and fasting."

have striven to breast the wave only to be hurled powerless back can estimate." Grant that it must be so. But this brings us to the very point we are endeavoring to reach. The victim is borne on and carried away by a force which is not of himself; a strength that is not his own, and which he feels powerless to resist. And that force is not insanity. In reasonable intervals he opposes it with his will, his judgment, and all the noble instincts of his nature. But at other times he is as one in the grasp of a giant, a struggling thing, but helpless. His will is bent to the will of his captor, and all his manhood yields. The demon of drink has overpowered him.

Now, one of the most marked symptoms of a demoniacal possession is the presence of a power, which takes possession of, controls, and makes the subject, in spite of himself, do its bidding. And so Satan takes a person with his natural temperament and surroundings, his infirmities, his tendencies (inherited, perhaps), his associates, his local and social allurements, and makes these at once the scene and the instruments of his machinations, leads on, increasing the power as the victim grows weaker, until at last the little thread has become a cable, the genial spirit he toyed with has become a monster, and that monster is his master.

Were a person to reach this depraved condition,—such a reversal of his moral nature,—at once, without the intermediate progressive steps, little hesitation would there be in imputing it to the possession of a devil. But how much more effectually can an evil spirit obtain the mastery, when, adapting himself to the temperament, character, and circumstances of the individual, and making use of these in a manner corresponding with the natural progress from stage to stage to a downfall!

But there is another indication of the presence and working of a spirit of evil in the career we have sketched. Each stage in the downward progress is marked by an increased moral degradation. So much so that, when the lowest extreme is reached, there comes a complete reversal of the moral nature. They who have to deal with such cases will bear abundant testimony that, however exalted the character may at first have been, yet, to procure the means of gratification, there is no resort too low, no means too base, and no conduct sufficiently devoid of all sense of honor or of shame. The person conducts as though he had made an actual compact with Satan to lie, to steal, perjure himself, murder wife and children by starvation and suffering, to become a companion of low thieves and gamblers,

and the depraved of every description—to serve Satan in all these relations and capacities, if only that demon-master will give him the drink he craves. A learned writer asks: "Why is drunkenness a vice so reprobated by the Deity? Because, of all material conditions it is that one which most emphatically obscures, defaces, and degrades the only divine elements in us,—the mind and the soul." *

There is yet another indication. In the supposed case already given of one who believes himself so completely under the control of appetite that resistance is absolutely impossible, and yet who would not drink if in the cup were mingled a poison that brings instant death, we find that there is something stronger than the demon. It is the fear of immediate death. He has no difficulty in realizing what death is. He has known always that death might meet him at any moment, and he has run the risk. But when, instead of risk there is certainty, and death is looking at him full in the face, that is a different matter. He is indeed a king of terrors then. And he comes not alone, but in his train are the darkness of

* A similar reversal of one's moral nature is apparent in the case of the lowest class of criminals. What to others is evil, to them is good. It is the influence of Satan upon man's spiritual nature.

the grave, and beyond, a blacker darkness and the undying worm.

The fear of immediate death, because it is a real fear, will hold the adversary at bay and nerve the man to resist him. If now there be any other emotion equally strong, that also will oppose to the demon a successful resistance. The Christian's faith, then, if it be an honest faith (and that which is not honest deserves not the name)—the Christian's faith has borne martyrs to the stake, the flames, the rack, the torture, the wild beasts; has endured confiscation, poverty, a life among the tombs, cold and hunger and starvation rather than deny the Saviour. There is, then, something more powerful even than the fear of death. In that will be found a strength, not only to bear one up in single assaults, but to trample upon and hold down the demon—to beat down Satan under the feet. It is literally Christ casting out the demon. It is the spirit of evil overcome by the Spirit of God.

Here, then, is a fact: there is an unseen power of evil that does make men lawless and disobedient. It is a power. There is not one of us who has not felt it. We fight it with our wills. We call to our aid all that is honorable and manly within us, and still at times it masters us. How like an avalanche an ap-

petite or a lust comes crashing down upon poor human nature, bearing moral havoc in its path! And we do not get rid of the fact by denying that this power of wickedness is personal. Why, evil associations, evil men tempt to wrong, and they who succumb to the influence are led astray to their own destruction. Sum up all the wrong done in the world through the evil influence of man upon man. What a world of depravity is the result! Whence comes that depravity? Is it innate in man? If so, then to man's nature belongs all that blackness of iniquity which we are wont to style diabolical. But we prefer to believe that from a deeper depth of degradation to which man has not yet been cast down there is an Evil One, viler, more horribly degraded than he—one to whom he owns no kinship, and to which he holds no relation but that of an eternal foe.

CHAPTER XI.

EARLY HISTORY.

The Chaldean account of Creation as given in the tablets unearthed at Nineveh by Smith brings before us the earliest history of the world. The tablets themselves are of a date two thousand years before Christ, the age of Abraham, and possibly while Noah was still living; and their record came from a still earlier age. They are, no doubt, antediluvian traditions. As compared with the Mosaic record, there is a remarkable correspondence, the difference being what might naturally be supposed to arise if we regard Genesis as having the true account of the Creation and Fall (whether derived from documents actually handed down from the Adamic age or directly revealed to Moses), while the Chaldean is a narrative of the same events by the hands of polytheists who enlarged upon and otherwise changed the original. And thus we have, it may be, a story bearing a relation to the true narrative similar to that of Milton's great poem to the Bible record.

It represents the Almighty as surrounded by the heavenly host who sing His praises. Suddenly there is a revolt. The rebellious host are banished, and in their room is created mankind. Man is described as made pure and holy, but "the dragon tempted him. The god Hea heard and was angry because his man had corrupted his purity." Thus the earliest record attests the fact of the fall of the angels, the creation of man, and his temptation and fall.

Dualism, or two gods, one good the other evil, and both equal in power, is a feature of most of the ancient heathen religions. But it has been very satisfactorily proved that all such beliefs are a departure from a more ancient monotheism. As to Ahriman, whom the Babylonians and other orientals of the seventh and eighth centuries before Christ regarded as an independent divinity, having a separate jurisdiction in the world, Thebaud, in his work on "Gentilism,"* shows that, according to the earliest doctrine, Mithra, a mediator, overcame Ahriman and drove him from heaven. Consequently he could not have been equal in power to Ahura-Mazda, from whom Mithra sprung. The oriental Devil, then, was not originally a dual divinity; but, like the Satan of the Script-

* "Gentilism," p. 192.

ures, a personal agent and enemy, but by no means an equal of the Creator.

It is not proposed to give an account of the rabbinical demonology. The literature on that subject, while not without its beauties, is in the main grotesque, fantastic, and frivolous, and the reading of it is most trying to the patience. A very good summary may be found in Edelsheim's "Life and Times of the Messiah," Appendix xiii., Vol. II. (Randolph, N. Y.). The doctrine of the rabbins, both as to angelology and demonology, does not correspond with that of the Bible. The angels are rather elves than high spiritual beings, and Satan is "only a clumsy, and—to speak plainly —often a stupid hater." *

The early Church made no formal declaration upon this subject. There were diversities of opinion then as there are now. But this diversity, both in angelology and Satanology, was in reference to minor points, not to the subject itself.

Thus there was no diversity whatever as to the fact that there were such beings as angels. But it was a question whether the angels were employed in the work of creation, or were merely spirits ministering to the heirs of salvation. The fathers were not scientists; and

* See Appendix C.

while all admitted that the angels could assume form and appear to men, it was a question whether this form was highly attenuated matter, a corporeal substance, or only an appearance, like a vision. And yet again, while it was agreed by all that Satan and his host were fallen angels, who had formerly held rank among celestial spirits, yet the cause of their fall was a matter of dispute. Of course they fell through misuse of their freedom, pride and envy being the cause of Satan's fall. But whether it was envy of man, as some held, or of God, as Lactantius and others maintained, was a question. The fall of the others was quite generally attributed to their "lust after the daughters of men." So Genesis vi. 2 was interpreted. The souls of these giants were regarded as intermediate between men and evil angels, serving the latter as patrons of heathenism, with all its oracles, lying wonders, superstitions, etc.

The heathen divinities they regarded as demons. The heathen themselves in like manner so regarded them. But by the word demon, the heathen meant the spirits of departed human beings, some of whom were good, and some evil. But what did the early Christians mean by demons? We quote, in reply, from Justin Martyr:

"Ye judge not righteous judgment; but, under the excitement of unreasonable passion, and lashed on by the scourges of evil demons, ye punish without judgment and without thought. For the truth must be spoken. Evil demons, in times of old, assuming various forms, went unto the daughters of men, and committed other abominations; and so astonished the minds of men with wonders which they displayed that they formed not a rational judgment of what was done, but were hurried away by their fears; so that, not knowing them to be evil demons, they styled them gods, and addressed them by the name which each demon imposed upon himself. And when Socrates, in a spirit of true wisdom and research, endeavored to bring all this to light and to lead men away from the worship of demons, the demons themselves so wrought by the hands of men who delighted in wickedness, as to put him to death as an atheist, or impious, under the pretence that he was introducing new deities. And so in like manner do they act towards us. For not only was this declared to the Greeks by Socrates, at the suggestion of right reason, but also in other lands by Reason, even the Word itself, which appeared in bodily form, and was made man, and was called Jesus Christ. We then, believing in

Him, declare that the demons who did such things, not only are no gods, but are evil and unholy spirits, whose actions are not even equal to those of virtuous men. Hence it is that we are styled atheists." *

As to this interpretation of Genesis vi. 2, it appears to have been the general opinion of antiquity. Josephus, however, and others, regard the offspring of this intercourse as the "giants in those days" who, however, were swept away and exterminated by the flood. But with those who held to the view here stated by Justin Martyr, as nearly all of the Christian fathers of the first period did, demons were fallen angels, and the offspring of those "sons of God," who, having become evil, "came in unto the daughters of men." † This opinion, however, gradually gave way before the arguments of Chrysostom, and is not the received interpretation of modern times. The "sons of God" are believed to have been the pious race descended from Seth, who simply married—"took wives" of the "daughters of men," or Cainitic women, by which means

* "Apology," § 5.

† Hagenbach quotes Routh as authority for saying that all the fathers of the first period, with the exception of Julius Africanus, took this view. But this of course does not refer to the apostasy of Satan himself, but only to the offspring of this intercourse.

the corruptions of Cain's race spread among the Sethites.

Before proceeding with the history of demonology in the Christian Church, it may be well to settle here one point. The reader will surely find no difficulty in understanding the words of Justin Martyr above quoted, as to who and what, in his view, demons were. Farmer, however, who is the great authority on the Sadducean side of this question, endeavors to show that Justin Martyr regarded demons as only the departed spirits of men. In proof he quotes these words: "Men who are seized and thrown down by the souls of the departed, who are commonly called demoniac and mad." But the context does not sustain the inference which Farmer draws from these words. Justin, arguing with the emperor, in favor of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, appeals to the fact that the heathen themselves acknowledge this doctrine in their "acts of necromancy, the inspection of the bodies of pure children (for the purpose of divination),* the calling forth of human souls, and those whom your magicians call senders of dreams and familiar spirits, and

* Under the persuasion that the souls of the victims were then present and revealed the knowledge of futurity to those who consulted them.

the practice of those who are skilled in such matters may induce you to believe that souls, after death, are still in a state of sensibility. To these may be added the men who are seized and thrown down by the souls of the departed who are commonly called demoniac and mad; and what are styled oracles among you, such as those of Amphilocus and Dodone, the Pythian, and the like: the opinions also of writers, such as Empedocles, Plato, and Socrates: the trench mentioned by Homer, and the descent of Ulysses to see these things; together with the tenets of those who have spoken to the same effect."

Now we submit, is it for a moment to be supposed that because Justin Martyr instances these things to a heathen emperor, as the belief of Justin himself as well as *the common belief of the heathen*, that therefore he, Justin Martyr, believes them also? On the contrary, it is simply an *argumentum ad hominem*. It is equivalent to saying, you, a heathen, deny the Christian's doctrine of the soul's immortality, and yet here is what you and the heathen generally believe. Accordingly, he immediately adds to what I have just quoted, "Give us now the same degree of credit which you give to them; inasmuch as our confidence in the power of God is no less, but greater than

theirs; for we expect that we shall each again take upon us our bodies which are dead and cast into the earth, holding that nothing is impossible to God."

As the case of Justin Martyr has now been disposed of, and as the Sadducean argument turns upon the meaning he attached to the word demon, here is the proper place to dispose effectually of other questions arising from the use of that word.

Δαίμων was the word the Greeks used for devil. The translators of the Septuagint accordingly adopted it. But the Greek demons were departed spirits of men. It has therefore been inferred that that word when found in the Septuagint means departed spirits also. Farmer asks, "Why should it be inferred that these writers use these words in a different sense from all the Greeks when speaking of the same subject? Besides, did not the authors of the Septuagint know (what all the world knew) that the heathen gods had once been men? Could they be ignorant that in the books they translated, and which they acknowledged to be inspired, these gods were represented in this their true light?"

The answer to this is the simple fact that the Septuagint writers did not always use the word demon in the heathen sense. In Psalm

xc. 6, which in our version reads, "In the morning it flourisheth and groweth up, in the evening it is cut down and withereth," the Septuagint has for this last clause *και δαιμονιον μεσημβρινον*. This is rather a pestilential blast than a departed soul. Again, the satyrs of Isaiah xiii. 21 are in the Septuagint *δαίμονιαι*. Were these departed souls? And yet it has even been maintained, because the New Testament writers used the word *δαίμων* and its derivatives, that they must have applied to it the same meaning with the Greeks. Of course the reader will see the inference it is intended he should draw, viz., that as the New Testament writers *did not believe* that any such demons had power to afflict men, therefore they did not believe in demoniacal possessions, but only employed language in accordance with the usage of the Jews of that day.*

But to resume. The chief tokens of the agency of evil angels or demons in the world were supposed to be violent diseases, earthquakes, volcanoes, tempests, failures of crops, drought, famine, pestilence, murrain, the persecution of Christians, astrology, the arts of

* It is true that Josephus says that demons are the spirits of wicked men. (Bel. Jud. lib. vi. § 3.) But the context shows that he is stating, not what he supposed to be true, but the heathen conception of them.

divination, the lying wonders of heathenism, and even heathen philosophy. It was the current opinion that madness or lunacy was due to demoniacal possessions, although Possidonius combated this view. Still the theologians were against him. According to Origen, every vice has its demon; every vicious person is possessed with a demon who serves a chief demon. Tertullian calls evil spirits the executioners of God. In the third century, according to Minucius Felix, demoniacal possessions prevailed, as in the New Testament days; though in the Clementine Homilies this is questioned.*

The following description of a possession of the Devil, given by S. Cyril ("Cat. Lect.," XVI. 15), shows clearly that epilepsy was regarded by him (and probably generally in his day) as a demoniacal possession: "His [the Devil's] presence is most cruel; the sense of it most oppressive; the mind is darkened; his attack is an injustice also, and the usurpation of

* It is clear beyond question that the early Christians believed that as in New Testament times, Satan still actually took possession of persons, and that he could be expelled by the prayers of Christians. One of the challenges to the heathen was that they might bring before any of their tribunals one who claimed to be inspired by any of their divinities and any ordinary Christian would make him confess that he was a devil, and not a god.

another's possession. For he tyrannically uses another's body, another's instruments as his own property; he throws down him who stands upright (for he is akin to him who *fell from heaven*); he perverts the tongue and distorts the lips. Foam comes instead of words; the man is filled with darkness; his eye is open, yet the soul sees not through it; and the miserable man quivers convulsively before his death. The devils are truly foes of men, using them basely and pitilessly."

As to the power of evil spirits over the hearts of men in enticing them to evil, it was taught that man in the use of available means of grace is under no necessity of succumbing to their influence. "Fearing the Lord," says Hermas, "you will have dominion over the Devil; for there is no power in him." This view of Hermas may be said to have been entertained by all the great minds of the Church in all subsequent periods. Lactantius, however, attributes to the Devil greater power than others were willing to admit. His theory was that previous to the creation of the world God created a spirit (the Logos) like Himself, who possessed the attributes of the Father; but after that created another spirit in whom the divine seed did not remain. This one, moved by envy, especially towards his predecessor,

apostatized. Lactantius also calls the Logos the right, and Satan the left hand of God.*

Origen was of the opinion that even Satan could be converted and forgiven. But he does not always very clearly propound his views. He in one place identifies death with the Devil, in the passage, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." In this notion that in the end the Devil himself might be converted, Origen had not many followers. Still, the possibility of this is sometimes cautiously expressed by such writers as Didymus of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa. The opinion was, however, in the sixth century condemned by Justinian. Gregory the Great expresses the view which has substantially prevailed in all ages, viz.: that Satan rejoices in doing evil; is powerful, but his power is limited, was broken by Christ; and that he will be condemned to final punish-

* A note to Cyril, Lect. VIII. 7, says: "The fathers speak as if the Devil were originally the head of that order of angels to whom the administration of this world was committed. On sinning he made use of what power was left to him over it against his Maker, seducing man into idolatry," etc. "The Devil prompts, not forces men into sin." Cyril's idea of the Devil is (Lect. II. 4) that "he is the chief author of sin and parent of evil." "Before him sinned no one." "Framed good, he became a Devil of his own purpose of mind." God converts a wicked person into a means of salvation. "He suffers the Devil to wrestle with men that they who conquer him may be crowned."

ment after the general judgment. The power of the adversary, it was held, was resisted by the name of Christ when used in true faith. Great efficacy was, moreover, attributed to the sign of the cross. "But," says Hagenbach, "what was at first nothing more than a symbol of the power of faith itself became afterwards a mechanical *opus operatum*."

Our reverence for the fathers does not oblige us to assent to all their opinions. In fact, on many points they disagree among themselves The relation of the redemptive work of Christ to the adversary of souls was a theme which called forth no little diversity of sentiment, and some very strange doctrines. Thus, Gregory of Nyssa held that God deceived the Devil. Man having come under the dominion of Satan, our Lord, whose divine nature was concealed under His humanity, offered Himself to the Devil, as a ransom. Satan, finding that Jesus was his superior, considered Him as of more value to him than the race of man, and accordingly accepted the proposition. But the adversary was outwitted, because the Saviour, having the power over death, Satan could not retain Him. So man was ransomed and Jesus wrested Himself from Satan's grasp. Gregory of Nazianzen, however, says "it would be a shame to think" that a ransom was paid to the

Devil. Still, he thinks that a deception was practiced. "This consisted in this, that Christ assumed the form of man, in consequence of which the devil thought that he had only to do with a being like ourselves, while the power and glory of the Godhead dwelt in Him." *

Origen held that the ransom was actually paid to the Devil. Athanasius, on the other hand, regards the ransom as paid to God. It would have been contrary to justice not to punish sin; and yet God could not suffer man to fall in consequence of an imposition practiced by the Devil without extending the divine mercy. But nothing but death could save man from ruin. The Logos, however, could not die. He therefore assumed a human body, and offering Himself a sacrifice for all, destroyed the power of the Devil.

S. Augustine considered that Satan held man by a right of conquest. He says, "it would have been injustice if the Devil had not had the right to rule over the being whom he had taken captive." But "God the Son being clothed with humanity, subjugated even the Devil to man, extorting nothing from him by violence, but overcoming him by the law of justice."

Substantially the same views as the above

* Hagenbach's "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., p. 378.

were stated in another form, viz.: that God, when He created this world, gave it in charge of Satan, then unfallen; that when Satan apostatized, man being still Satan's subject was bought and redeemed from the power of Satan, by the sacrifice of Christ.

Isaiah's words (xiv. 12), "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground which didst weaken the nations!" were taken as referring to Satan, although Eusebius alone of all the *early* writers adopted this view.

The priests of the heathen saw with jealous eyes the gradually increasing spread and influence of Christianity. They scrupled at no means to defeat the enemy which threatened their own overthrow. Ecclesiastical history abounds in accounts of false charges against Christians, instigated by a heathen hierarchy. Constantine stated in a public letter the following occurrences, which he attested under oath. It was reported to the Emperor Diocletian that the oracle of Apollo had, in an unusual manner and in a mournful voice, complained that his responses had become unreliable, and sometimes false, because they were withstood by certain "just persons." The emperor, inquiring who these "just per-

sons" were, was informed by the oracle that they were Christians. Diocletian thereupon in a rage decided that severe laws should be enacted against them, and decreed that their religion should be extirpated.*

Lactantius relates how the Emperor Diocletian was, on one occasion, inspecting under the direction of heathen soothsayers the entrails of the animals to obtain auguries of future events. But some Christian ministers standing by made the sign of the cross. After several sacrifices, the chief soothsayer declared that he could make no discovery of the accustomed appearances, because some profane persons were present. Whereupon the emperor, in a rage, ordered all persons present to offer sacrifice, and that such as refused to do so should be scourged.

The former occurrence Constantine ascribes to the craft of the pagan priests, who by the trick sought, and successfully, too, to inflame the emperor against the Christians. But the second incident is regarded by Lactantius as a veritable miracle. He believes that the Devil, through the soothsayers, etc., did give responses, and that by the sign of the cross the power of Satan was frustrated—"Immortale signum frontibus suis imposuisse; hoc

* Mosheim's "Commentaries," Vol. II., p. 414.

facto dæmones fugatos, et sacra turbata esse."

Marcianus, an Egyptian of great repute as a magician, acquired an ascendency over the Emperor Valerian. But the Christians are said to have possessed the power, by a word or a nod, to countervail his magical skill, and disconcert and control the demons so that they were unable to exert their power. He thereupon prevailed upon the emperor to endeavor to extirpate the Christians. This story is given on the authority of Dionysius.

CHAPTER XII.

HISTORY—CONTINUED.

Exorcism was known in the Church from the earliest age. No fact is more clearly established than this. The Church, probably in the third century, instituted an inferior order of the ministry, known as exorcists. They were not ordained, but merely appointed by the bishop. Their duty was simply to exorcise demons from persons of whom they had gained possession, precisely like those cases mentioned in the New Testament. This power was not, however, confined to the exorcists. For while not until the third century was the order instituted, yet the practice was common to all Christians. A striking passage in Tertullian not only establishes this fact, but also attests the common belief among Christians in regard to the nature and character of heathen worship. Among other arguments used to dissuade Christians from military service under the heathen emperors, he says that they would be required to guard idol temples, and

thus to defend by night those devils whom they had put to flight by day by their exorcisms. He applies a similar argument against their making or selling such things as would uphold idolatry or the worship of devils.

The consecration to God in the sacrament of baptism implies a renunciation of sin. Satan being the author of all evil, there is therefore a renunciation of the Devil. Inasmuch as many of the early Christians were converts from heathenism, and as the forsaking of a false religion implied an abstaining from all participation in heathen rites and ceremonies, idolatrous processions, etc., so the early baptismal vows specified not only the Devil and all his works, but (what had special reference to heathenism) the pomps and vanities—the pageantry of idolatry, and, what was frivolous and immoral—heathen plays and shows of this wicked world, and the evil angels or demons who were regarded as the heathen gods. The practice of exorcism was introduced to cast out from the person to be baptized the demon who had held possession of him in his unregenerate state. This practice prevailed until about three centuries ago, and is still continued in the Eastern and the Roman Churches.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his "Catechetical

Lectures," lays great stress upon exorcism. He speaks of it as a peculiar gift bestowed upon some persons by the Holy Ghost. The following extracts not only show the esteem in which this rite was held, but also give some idea of the ceremonial itself.

"Without exorcisms the soul cannot be cleansed." "They are divine, collected from the divine Scriptures." "Thy face is veiled, that thy mind may be henceforth at leisure; lest a roving eye cause a roving heart. But though thine eyes be veiled, thine ears are not hindered receiving what is saying. For, as the goldsmith, conveying the blast upon the fire through delicate instruments, and, as it were, breathing upon the gold which is hid in the hollow of the forge, stimulates the flames it acts upon, and so obtains what he is seeking, so also exorcisers, infusing fear by the Holy Ghost and setting the soul on fire in the crucible of the body, make the evil spirit flee, who is our enemy; and salvation and the hope of eternal life abide; and henceforth the soul, cleansed from its sins, hath salvation."

"A man still with a body about him wrestles with many fiercest demons; and often the demon whom many men could not master with iron bands, has been mastered by him by words of prayer through the favor which is in

him of the Holy Ghost; and the mere breathing of the exorcist becomes as fire to that unseen foe." (Lect. XVI. 19.)

"Having stripped yourselves ye were naked, imitating Christ, who hung naked upon the cross." * * * "Then when ye were stripped ye were anointed with exorcised oil from the very hairs of your head to your feet, and were made partakers of the good olive tree, Jesus Christ. For ye were cut off from the wild olive tree and grafted into the good one, and were made to have the fatness of the good olive tree. The exorcised oil, therefore, was a symbol of the fatness of Christ, the charm to drive away every hostile influence. For, as the breathing of the saints and the invocation of the name of God, like fiercest flame scorch and drive out evil spirits, so also this exorcised oil receives such virtue by the invocation of God and by prayer, as not only to burn and cleanse away the traces of sins, but also to chase away the powers of the evil one." (Lect. XX. 3, 4.)

Cave ("Primitive Christianity," Part I., Chap. 10), says:

"There was a kind of exorcism and insufflation, or breathing in the face of the person baptized (which S. Augustine calls a most ancient tradition of the Church), by which they

signified the expelling of the evil spirit and the bringing in of the good Spirit of God: not that they thought that every one before baptism was possessed by the Devil, but only that we are by nature children of wrath, enemies to God, and slaves of Satan. Nor did they lay any stress upon the bare usage of those rites, but wholly upon the Church's prayers which at the time were made, that God would deliver those persons from the power of Satan, and by His Spirit unite them to the Church."

In the Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1549) is the following form of exorcism:

"Then let the Priest, looking upon the children, say: I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath vouchsafed to call to His holy Baptism, to be made members of His body and of His holy congregation. Therefore, thou cursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment, remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels. And presume not, hereafter, to exercise any tyranny towards these infants whom Christ hath bought with His precious blood, and by this His holy Baptism, calleth to be of His flock."

During the period of the witchcraft delusion the power of the Devil was associated with all that is awful. Previous to this time, however, the Devil of the middle ages seems, in the language of a German writer, "to play rather the part of a cunning impostor and merry fellow: more like a faun who excites laughter rather than fear."

The Reformers distinctly recognize the personality, the power and influence of Satan. Luther is said to have had a personal conflict with him. Calvin regarded the Devil as an unwilling instrument in the hands of God. He says: "It arises from himself and his wickedness that he opposes God with all his desires and purposes. This depravity stimulates him to attempt those things which he thinks most opposed to God. But since God holds him tied and bound with the bridle of His power, he executes only those things which are divinely permitted; and thus, whether he will or not, he obeys his Creator, being constrained to fulfil any service to which He impels him." (Inst. I. 14.)

Quite a distinguished writer on this subject was Balthazar Becker, D.D., who was born in Groningen in 1634, and died in Amsterdam in 1718. In his sermons he attacked the popular notions concerning the Devil. As

this elicited much inquiry, he published, in 1691, a work entitled "The World Bewitched," which was directed against the prevailing superstitions concerning witches, and the arts and powers supposed to be acquired by the assistance of spirits. He maintained that the belief of both Jews and Christians concerning divinities, spirits, and demons was derived from heathenism. He acknowledged the existence of the Devil and his angels as fallen celestials, but held that neither they nor the good angels who are employed in God's service exert any influence upon the souls and bodies of men. The existence of guardian angels he denied. His two great arguments are that spirit cannot act upon matter, and that the Scriptures represent the Devil as chained in the prison of hell. The story of our Lord's temptation is in his view figurative, an interchange of dangerous thoughts. Demoniacal possessions he sets down as simply diseases. He regards the Devil as a being of very little consequence, and men will find the true origin of their own sins if they will but search their consciences.

In the middle of the seventeenth century lived Arnold Guelinx, of Leyden, who published a work not absolutely denying, but questioning the existence of a personal spirit of

evil, and intimating that the demoniacal possessions of the New Testament might be diseases. Similar speculations were advanced in 1687 by Daillon, a French Reformed preacher.

Christian Thomasius, in 1702, wrote a work against the belief in a material Devil with horns and hoofs, as commonly represented. Nor did he regard any doctrine concerning the Devil as an essential part of Christianity.

Heathen divinities, as already shown, were regarded by both Jews and Christians as demons, as they were by the worshippers themselves. Even those Christian writers who may have entertained doubts on this subject may still have felt that they were doing no violence to the truth, when they called a worship instigated by Satan, and without doubt highly pleasing to him, devil-worship.

Meantime those heathen and pagan priests who knew full well that "an idol is nothing in the world" realized that their own influence and power depended upon the degree to which they held the people to their superstitions. They fostered superstition among their dupes; and it is not necessary for us, because they were heathen and avowed an intercourse with demons, to admit the fact; yet this is what was done by Christians generally through the middle ages, and even down to the present cen-

tury. Their process of reasoning seems to have been this: Paganism is of the Devil. Pagan priests acknowledge and boast that they have intercourse with demons; and therefore their arts and their sorceries and their soothsayings are not to be regarded as tricks and impostures, but as actual workings of the Devil.

In consequence of this wholesale consigning of heathenism and paganism to the region of actual diabolical intercourse, it is not surprising that such superstition had a damaging effect upon the people. History is not without instances of members of Christian communities going over to the superstitions of heathenism, believing that they thus gained access to the spirits of the other world, coming into the possession of power by means of their charms.

CHAPTER XIII.

POST-REFORMATION PERIOD.

In the post-reformation period, there has been comparatively little of the superstition which characterized the middle ages; and as extremes are always followed by reaction, there has been of late much of skepticism on this subject. While with some a belief in the power of the Devil over the bodies of men has been maintained, and even exorcisms practiced,* yet the days of demoniacal possessions have generally been regarded as past. Where the existence of a personal evil adversary has not been denied, his power has been supposed to be limited to instigations to evil.

German rationalism, which was in the ascendant during the last half of the eighteenth century, denied the existence of evil angels and demoniacal possessions. But we have the as-

* As Gasner, a Roman Catholic, in 1773 and Justinus Kerner, a Protestant, in 1832.—*Hagenbach*, Vol. II., p. 425. Also Joseph Wolff in 1821.

surance of no less an authority than Dorner that there is a strong counter-current in the theological thinking of Germany. He says, "Nistzsch, Twesten, Rothe, Julius Müller, Tholuck, Lange, Martensen, as well as Thomasius, Hoffman, Kahnis, Philippi, and Luthardt avow not merely that sin is found in humanity, but that a kingdom of evil spirits with a head over them is also to be inculcated. Romang rightly satirizes the fond enlightenment which takes credit for being above this representation." ("System of Christian Doctrine," § 85.)

Swedenborg maintained that angels and spirits are human beings; that they all derive their origin from the human race. That which is in man, viz., his spirit, is in his view, according to its true nature, an angel; and accordingly man was created to become an angel.

The Rev. Hugh Farmer, a dissenting minister, pastor of a congregation at Walthamstow, in Engand, and who died in 1787, became widely known as a writer of much ability on the subject of the demoniacs of the New Testament, our Lord's temptation in the wilderness, the worship of human spirits among the ancient heathen, and kindred topics. We have had occasion to quote from this author

and discuss some of the points raised by him. As his views have had no slight influence upon the Sadducean side of this question, it is but proper that we should show from his own statement of his sentiments to what weight he is entitled as an authority.

Though denying the reality of demoniacal possessions in the New Testament, yet he disclaims Sadduceanism. He does not question the reality of Satanical temptations. His position is thus stated by himself: "I have never denied, nor could I without great absurdity take upon me to deny, the existence of evil spirits originally of a rank superior to mankind. And, as we are ignorant of the laws of the spiritual world, it would be great presumption to take upon us to determine the sphere of their operations. That they have no dominion over the natural world, which is governed by fixed and invariable laws, is a truth attested in the amplest manner by reason, by revelation, and by our own experience. But the question is whether possessions are referred to fallen angels or to human spirits. To say that they are referred to the latter is by no means to banish the former out of the world."*

* "Letters to the Rev. Dr. Worthington, etc." London, 1778, pp. 82, 83.

Farmer not only holds that there were no demoniacal possessions, but that even if there had been such, *neither our Lord nor the Evangelists could have known the fact!* Here is evidence that, as Archbishop Whately has remarked, it is impossible to deny the fact of such possessions without imputing both to the writers of the New Testament and their Master either fraud or ignorance. Farmer recoils from the former, and comes down to unqualified rationalism by asserting the latter. One who takes that position must not only deny that there was such a gift as "discerning of spirits," but even that our Lord Himself "knew what was in man."

Farmer says that "the reality of possessions and dispossessions neither was nor could fitly be established by the authority of Christ and His apostles, considered as inspired and infallible persons." He says to Dr. Worthington: "You, sir, have not so much as attempted to prove that their inspiration extended to the knowledge of the secret causes of those symptoms which were called demoniacal possessions. Nevertheless, till you had previously established this point, you had no right to appeal to their inspiration on the present occasion. * * * Whatever opinion the Evangelists entertained concerning the reality of

possessions is to be considered as their own private opinion; in the philosophy of which we have no more concern than we have in the philosophy of S. Paul, when he said 'that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.'" *

What belief on this subject is required of a communicant of the Church of England is a question which a few years ago came up for decision. In 1874, Mr. Henry Jenkins, who maintained that there was no personal Devil, and published a work in defence of that view, was repelled from the Holy Communion by the Vicar of Christ Church, Clifton, in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol. There were other defects in the parishioner's orthodoxy, but our present concern is only with the subject before us. The matter came before the Court of Arches, and Sir Robert Phillimore, in giving judgment, adopted as his own the language of Dr. Blunt:

"It would be a waste of time to prove that in various degrees of clearness the personal existence of a spirit of evil is revealed again and again in Scripture. * * *

"From the beginning of the Gospels, where he appears as the personal tempter of our

* "Letters to the Rev. Dr. Worthington, etc." London, 1778, pp. 123, 124.

Lord, through all the Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse it is asserted and implied again and again as a familiar and important truth. To refer this to mere 'accommodation' of the language of the Lord and His apostles to the ordinary Jewish belief is to contradict facts and evade the meaning of words. The subject is not one on which error could be tolerated as unimportant; but one important, practical, and even awful. The language used respecting it is either truth or falsehood; and unless we impute error or deceit to the writers of the New Testament, we must receive the doctrine of the existence of Satan as a certain doctrine of revelation. Without dwelling on other passages, the plain, solemn, and unmetaphorical words of John viii. 44 must be sufficient: 'Ye are of your father, the Devil: * * * he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth. * * * When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar, and the father of it.'"

To this the judge adds, "If this be a correct representation of the account given in Holy Scriptures of the existence and personality of the Devil, it would certainly be very strange if the Church of England had considered the belief in this existence and personality a matter of indifference—if indeed she had not con-

sidered such belief a necessary part of Christian teaching."

Then, quoting from the Prayer Book and formularies all the passages in which the word Devil occurs, his conclusion is thus given:

"I am of opinion that the avowed and persistent denial of the existence and personality of the Devil did, according to the law of the Church, as expressed in her canons and rubric, constitute the promoter 'an evil liver, and a depraver of the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments' in such sense as to warrant the defendant in refusing to administer the Holy Communion to him until he disavowed or withdrew his avowal of this heretical opinion."

The late Rev. F. D. Maurice was a distinguished representative of what is known as the "Broad Church" school. Some of that school are understood to deny the personality of Satan. But Maurice has thus put himself upon record:

"You think you do not find a distinct recognition of the Devil's personality in my books —I am sorry if it is so. I am afraid I have been corrupted by speaking to a polite congregation. I do agree with my dear friend Charles Kingsley, and admire him for the boldness with which he has said that the Devil is sham-

ming dead, but that he never was busier than now. I do not know what he is by theological argument, but I know by what I feel. I am sure there is one near me accusing God and my brethren to me. He is not myself; I should go mad if I thought he was. He is near my neighbors; I am sure he is not identical with my neighbors. I must hate them if I believed he was. But oh! most of all, I am horror-struck at the thought that one may confound him with God; the perfect darkness with the perfect light. I dare not deny that it is an evil will that tempts me; else I should begin to think evil is in God's creation, and is not the revolt from God, resistance to Him. If he is an evil will, he must, I think, be a person. The Word upholds his existence, not his evil. That is in himself; that is the mysterious, awful possibility implied in his being a will. I need scarcely say that I do not mean by this acknowledgment of an evil *spirit* that I acknowledge a *material* devil. But does any one?" ("Life and Letters," Vol. II., p. 21.)

CHAPTER XIV.

HISTORY—CONTINUED.

THERE is to-day, among persons of all classes, an unquestioning belief in the supernatural, viz., that intelligences of the unseen world have had communication with men; that they still have the power to do so when not restrained by the divine will; that whether they actually do so now, or not, is a question not of possibility or of probability, but of fact, requiring to be substantiated by sufficient evidence. But in view of the great advance in science, many things which in former ages were with unquestioning assertion attributed to the agency of supernatural intelligences are now known to be due to the operation of natural causes, though sometimes under certain abnormal conditions. And inasmuch as science has exploded many such superstitions, the result has been a latent skepticism as to the supernatural. On account of the improbability of such phenomena, we demand in proof of them stronger evidence, in proportion to the degree of their improbability.

But after all, the interference of the powers and intelligences of the unseen world with the affairs of the seen is merely a question of fact. We are accustomed to the phrase, "the age of miracles is past." But that is a question of fact. One clearly established and proven instance of miracle to-day overthrows it. One might then retreat to the position that miracles occur only at very rare intervals. That, too, is an assertion for facts to establish or refute.

We are in truth better able now to judge of the facts than were our progenitors of the middle ages, or even of a century ago. The mind of man demands a cause for whatever takes place. When no cause in the known course of nature can be assigned, a scientific mind attributes it to some natural cause not yet ascertained. The superstitious will without hesitation attribute it to some of the agencies of the unseen world.

Go back, then, to an age when ignorance characterized the people generally, an ignorance implying a superstition which to a great degree infected all ranks: when even the learned were not learned in the forces and laws of nature; when chemistry meant alchemy, and astronomy meant astrology; when medicine meant incantation; when commercial and

social intercourse, and even trials and decisions in courts were more or less influenced by signs and omens. Add to these the fact that the people of such an age were the not very remote descendants of heathen and barbarous tribes, who, ignorant of the true religion, were the victims of a wild, weird, grotesque, or fanciful superstition, with customs and usages the natural outgrowth of their fictions; here are conditions out of which necessarily come romantic traditions of semi-human divinities, superhuman acts of heroism, demons and nymphs and fairies of mountain and forest and field. Out of these conditions come the vanirs and the trolls of the Norsemen, the gnomes of the regions of the Rhine, the goblins and fairies of Britain, and the witchcraft of the seventeenth century.

It is not the purpose of the present writer to give a history of witchcraft. That such a dark and terrible delusion should afflict humanity for a century, bending to its sway the intellects of scholars and divines and judges and councils and rulers, entering the households of devout Christians as well as of the irreligious, dragging to torture and execution gentle and cultured women and even children, subserving oftentimes the purposes of per-

sonal hate and private revenge, as well as ministering to blind, religious zeal and fanaticism—that all this is not due to the instigation and personal machination of the Devil, that great adversary of God and man, is a supposition too preposterous to be entertained.

A perusal, however, of the history of those times, of the trials of the accused persons, and an examination of the testimony offered in such cases can leave little doubt that the particular phemonena which were attributed to witchcraft were due to natural causes, disease, nervous susceptibility, weakness, or to imposture. Without here asserting or denying the fact of demoniacal possessions in any one or more of the phenomena of the days of witchcraft, we have in the causes already assigned an explanation of much of the so-called demonology of the middle and subsequent ages. We know why many cases which with us would be stamped as monomania or other form of insanity, and as such placed under medical treatment, were regarded as witchcraft or some kind of inspiration. We know that many authenticated cases of spectral appearance, and firmly believed to be visitations from the unseen world, would by us be pronounced clear cases of optical illusion.

The men of those times were not skilled in medicine. They knew next to nothing of science as we understand it. One thing, however, they did know: that our Lord had, on earth, by His own personal power healed diseases and cast out devils. They knew that some of the diseases of New Testament mention were due to the possession of the Devil. Most natural was the inference that that disease which manifests itself chiefly in strange and frequently vicious language and abnormal conduct was in all cases a possession of the Devil, and the patients were treated accordingly. When at length the witchcraft delusion appeared to add its horrors, the condition of society was deplorable. The consecrated priests of God whose commission it was to wage a warfare against the Devil, believed that they were but fulfilling the duties of their office when they imprisoned and tortured and put to death the poor victims of hysteria or imbecility or dementia, or even those whom those supposed to be possessed might denounce or accuse.

But it was to the *ignorance* not to the *religion* of the age that this was due. Ecclesiastics called insanity diabolism and witchcraft, and treated it accordingly. But when science, uncovering the brain of the lunatic, proved it a

disease, insanity was no longer in the hands of the ecclesiastics. Lawyers and magistrates took it up; and they, not the priests this time, condemned the lunatic to the dungeon and the chain and the scourge. *If theology is responsible for one of these inhumanities, then the law is responsible for the other.* Whereas it was neither religion in the one case nor the law in the other, but ignorance in both cases, that was responsible. Science conferred a benefit upon society when it first taught the ecclesiastic that insanity was a disease, and then taught the physician and the magistrate that they could learn the proper treatment of the disease from the tender heart and loving precepts of the Saviour.

In any age, however, each case coming under personal observation is to be disposed of upon its own merits. It is not to be set aside with the assertion that the powers and agencies of the unseen world never make themselves manifest in the seen. Nor, though we know that the people of past ages were superstitious, and that there are sufficient reasons to explain the fact, are we justified in denying that the influence of supernatural agencies, good or bad, were ever manifest. Amidst all the gross and fantastic superstitions of the middle ages, and of the

age of witchcraft even, there is still room for facts, implying the presence of supra-natural intelligences and powers. But such facts should be established by indubitable proof.

CHAPTER XV.

MODERN DIABOLISM.

THE saying of our Lord, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," seems to have settled, in the minds of writers both ancient and modern, the fact that Satan's power has been greatly crippled by the coming and ministry of our Saviour. Many have regarded it as indicating the cessation of those phenomena which through the New Testament are known to us as demoniacal possessions. Facts seem to confirm this view in great part. Such possessions, common in the times of our Saviour and His Apostles, were of less frequency in the early ages of the Church. Whether they ever entirely disappeared or are occasionally manifest still, is a question upon which possibly some light may be thrown in the following pages.

There is an impression, derived from the statements of travellers and others, that in some non-Christian lands are to be found unquestionable cases of demoniacal possession.

The investigation of this subject is greatly hampered by the looseness of the available testimony. They who make the most positive assertions on this subject are often so very sure and unquestioning themselves that they overlook the fact that others cannot be equally sure without clear and satisfactory proof. Again, if the mere scientist is too skeptical as to the supernatural, the mere theologian is in danger of lending too ready an ear to the superstitious. An eminent divine, speaking of demoniacal possessions in modern times, alludes, without any qualification, to the testimony of Huc, the Roman Catholic missionary and traveller in Tartary, Thibet, and China, as supporting his views. Turning to that author, we find the following to be the true statement of the case:

With his party, Huc was making his way on camel-back through Tartary. Meeting a number of people making their way in one direction, he ascertained, upon inquiry, that there was to be a great assemblage at a place called Rache-churin, where a Lama Bokte was to display his power. The following is Huc's account of the performance. He was not an eye-witness, but relates with most unquestioning faith a most extraordinary achievement, simply upon the testimony of others, and with

equal faith attributes it to the Devil. We give the account, disgusting as it is.

"When the appointed hour has arrived, the whole multitude of pilgrims repair to the great court of the Lama convent, where an altar is erected. At length the Bokte makes his appearance; he advances gravely, amid the acclamations of the crowd, seats himself on the altar, and taking a cutlass from his girdle, places it between his knees, while the crowd of Lamas, ranged in a circle at his feet, commence the terrible invocations that prelude this frightful ceremony. By degrees, as they proceed in their recitation, the Bokte is seen to tremble in every limb, and gradually fall into strong convulsions. Then the song of the Lamas becomes wilder and more animated, and the recitation is exchanged for cries and howlings. Suddenly the Bokte flings away the scarf which he has worn, snatches off his girdle, and with the sacred cutlass rips himself entirely open. As the blood gushes out the multitude prostrate themselves before the horrible spectacle, and the sufferer is immediately interrogated concerning future events and things concealed from human knowledge. His answers to all these questions are regarded as oracles.

"As soon as the devout curiosity of the pil-

grims is satisfied, the Lamas resume their recitations and prayers; and the Bokte, taking up in his right hand a quantity of blood, carries it to his mouth, blows three times upon it, and casts it into the air with a loud cry. He then passes his hand rapidly over his stomach, and it *becomes whole as it was before;* without the slightest trace being left of the diabolical operation, with the exception of an extreme lassitude. The Bokte then rolls his scarf again around his body, says a short prayer in a low voice, and all is over; every one disperses except a few of the most devout, who remain to contemplate and adore the bloody altar."

Commenting on this transaction, M. Huc says: "We cannot think that all the facts of this nature are to be set down to the account of fraud; for, after all that we have seen and heard among idolatrous nations, we are persuaded that Satan plays an important part in them; and our opinion is confirmed by that of the best instructed Buddhists with whom we have conversed upon the subject."

In 1850 the Rev. Mr. Caldwell, a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, published a small work giving an account of the Tinnevelley Shanars, among whom he had labored. He describes the entire province of Tinnevelley as an arid

plain, extending from the Ghauts to the sea. The soil is generally unproductive, except at the bases of mountains and the margins of rivers. The Shanars are the most numerous class among the heathen in the south-eastern parts of this region. Their occupation, which, according to Hindu usage, is restricted to the members of a particular class, is that of cultivating and climbing the Palmyra palm, the juice of which they boil into a coarse sugar. This is the weary labor appointed to their race; though they are not the lowest, but a middle class between the Vellalars and their Pariah slaves.

Among the Tinnevelley Shanars demon-worship prevails universally God, as the Supreme Being, hardly obtains the mention of a recognition. He is good, and will take care of the Hindu race, who are His children; hence there is no need to worship or appease Him.* But demons abound everywhere, and are capa-

* In Greenland, the inhabitants pay little regard to the good Pirksama, meaning in their language "He above there," because they know that He will do them no harm; but they zealously worship the evil power, Angekok, from whom their priests, medicine men, and conjurers are also named; and all the operations of the magicians are supposed to become effectual from the co-operation of Angekok and his inferior spirits.—Hewitt's "History of the Supernatural," Vol. II., p. 26.

ble of inflicting any amount of mischief and misery. They must therefore be propitiated by worship and sacrifice. The majority of them are supposed to have once been human beings, who in life were dreaded for their violence or crimes. Any malady beyond the skill of their rude and ignorant doctors is supposed to be a possession of the Devil. This is particularly noticed in the case of protracted and obstinate sickness.

One means of expelling the Devil is by beating the patient, until the obstinacy of the demon is supposed to be overcome, when he exclaims, "I go! I go!" In answer to inquiries he then gives his name, stating that he is some devil whom they have neglected, and to whom they must now make an offering. Or, he claims to be a deceased relative who, they now for the first time learn, has become a demon.

"As soon as the demon consents to leave, the beating ceases; and not unfrequently immediate preparations are made for a sacrifice, as a compensation to his feelings for the ignominy of the exorcism. The possessed person now awakes as from a sleep, and appears to have no knowledge of anything that has happened."

The writer to whom I am indebted for the above account evidently has his doubts as to

the reality of these demoniacal possessions; for he gives it as his experience that these demons generally yield to European medical treatment, and that in the majority of cases the most effectual exorcism is tartar emetic.

We give here the result of the experience of this writer. He had been twelve years a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts at Endyengoody, in Tinnevelley.

"I do not contend that real demoniacal possessions do not occur in heathen countries. Where Satan rules without opposition and where belief in the reality and frequency of possessions is so general, it is natural to suppose that there must be some foundation for the belief. Popular delusions generally include a fact. My mind is open to receive evidence upon the subject; and considering the number of astonishing cases that almost every native says he has been told of by those who have seen them, I had hoped some day to witness something of the kind myself. But I have not yet had an opportunity of being present where preternatural symptoms were exhibited, though I have sought for such an opportunity for nearly twelve years, the greater part of the time in a devil-worshipping community. This is the experience, as far as I

have heard, of all British and American missionaries, with the exception of one dubious case. Our German brethren seem to have been more fortunate."

The same writer remarks that superstitions concerning goblins and demons prevail all over India. He says:

"Every Hindu work containing allusions to native life, and the dictionaries of all the Hindu dialects, prove the general prevalence of a belief in the existence of malicious or mischievous demons, in demoniacal inflictions and possessions, and in the expulsive power of exorcisms. The chief peculiarity of the superstition as it exists among the Shanars consists in their *systematic worship* of the demons in which all believe. In every part of India innumerable legends respecting goblins and their malice are current; but scarcely any trace of their worship in the proper sense of the term, much less of their exclusive worship, can be discovered beyond the districts in which Shanars or other primitive illiterate tribes are found."

As to the effects of these superstitions upon the people he remarks:

"This superstition respecting demons, in whatever form and under whatever modifications it may appear, is found to be productive

of evil; but it was reserved for the Shanars and a few other illiterate tribes to exemplify the debasing effect of it in its fullest extent by their worship of demons—a degradation beneath which the human mind cannot descend."

These devil-worshippers, however, believe that Christians have nothing to fear from demons. Our author says, "The demonolaters seem to consider European Christians as secure from danger. They suppose them even more than a match for any of the poor blackman's goblins."

The celebrated missionary, Joseph Wolff,* has a weird account of a tribe of devil-worshippers inhabiting the region known as Shinar in the Scriptures. They dwell in a mountain called Sanjaar. They are murderers and the terror of every caravan passing in the vicinity. Layard says that they do not know the name "Mani"; but Wolff has heard them say "Mani" and "Perno" and "Hora," which names are also known among the Buddhists of Thibet. He suspects the Yezeedi to be a remnant of the old Manichæans.

Wolff proceeds to say that he saw an old man with a white beard riding upon a mule,

* "Travels and Adventures of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, LL.D." London: Saunders Otley & Co., 1861.

and who waved his hand and said, verbatim, as follows: "Will the Lord have ever mercy upon you again? Will He ever bring you back to the fold, O ye mountaineers of Sanjaar? O Lord, bring them back! bring them back!"

This old man said that the inhabitants of that mountain were formerly (about 1675) Christians. But they were persecuted by the mountaineers of Mahallamia, who were apostates from Christianity to Mohammedanism, and by the mountaineers of Miana, who were devil-worshippers, and apostatized, pulling down their churches and becoming worshippers of the Devil.

In the devil-worship of this tribe Wolff believes there is to be found the meaning of the word satyr, and a remarkable fulfilment of prophecy. The word satyr has been somewhat of a puzzle to commentators. Goats, goat-footed demons, and hairy demons have been given as the meaning. Says Wolff, "It is translated more correctly in the Arabic translation of Isaiah, made by Warka the Jew, *Shaytan*, *i.e.*, the Devil. And by Luther, Weld-Teufel, and by Jerome, Demons."

In Isaiah's prophecy of the desolations of Babylon (Is. xiii. 19–22) occur the words: "Their houses shall be full of doleful creatures,

and owls shall dwell there, and *satyrs shall dance there*." Now here is the fact, that once every year this same tribe of *devil-worshippers* perform in the night-time, "*a dance around the ruins of Babylon*, in honor of Sagheer, *i.e.*, the little god,—the Devil. For they never call him Devil." Beyond this the particulars of their worship and their fearful night orgies are not known. The impression created upon travellers, however, is thus described: Fearful indeed is that spot! Dim lights wander about it. They are as the ghosts of the slain. "At certain times one hears howlings. They are the howlings of the damned—shrieks and grinsings (snarlings) of wicked spirits" (p. 194).

As the word azazel, to which a definite meaning cannot be given, yet evidently refers to something demoniac, so may it be with the word satyr. The requirements of the original would be satisfied by the rendering "and the worshippers of the Devil shall dance there."

In a work which is an account of the life and journeys of Wolff, derived from his writings, the author gives the following facts in regard to an occurrence, the report of which attracted much attention at the time. The missionary was journeying in Palestine.

"One night, when their tents were pitched

in the desert, not far from Gaza, some time after they had retired they heard a most unnatural and almost unearthly sound of laughter, mixed with fits of crying. They called out to know what it was; and Ahmad, their servant, told them it proceeded from one of the Bedouin Arabs who was called *Haj-Ali*, *i.e.*, a pilgrim Ali—for he had been in Mecca—and who was possessed with a devil. This dreadful misfortune some people have imagined to be only lunacy; but it is far otherwise. After listening a few moments longer, Wolff cried in a loud voice in Arabic, 'In the name of Jesus be silent!' and immediately all was hushed. About twenty minutes after the man began to talk wildly, and the dreadful gibberish began again. Wolff again, in the same manner, called out, so that all the Arabs heard him, and again the fiend was silenced, and soon after they all went to sleep.

"In the morning the Greek servants told Wolff that the possessed man had said many wonderful things. Among others, when Wolff spoke, he asked who was there? They answered, 'No one.' To which he replied, 'There was. I saw him. But he is gone.' When he became wild again he exclaimed, 'Elias is here!' And on Cavass (the Turkish soldier who travelled with them) saying something

about Mohammed, Haj-Ali said he was a pig (a common term of contempt among the Arabs).

"The poor man wanted Wolff to give him a *paper* against the spirit; meaning probably a charm; but Wolff prayed in Arabic to the Lord to deliver him from his plague, and told him to pray to Jesus Christ, and then he need not fear the Devil—giving him a New Testament at the same time.

"Two days afterwards Haj-Ali had another attack which Wolff subdued in the same manner, one loud cry issuing from the man's mouth before he was still again. And afterwards he told Wolff that he knew that the Devil came, because he smelt the incense in the charcoal pan (it being the custom, in using charcoal, to throw a species of incense, compounded of some gum, upon it, in order to do away with its deleterious effects).

"The poor fellow knowing the custom,—probably from experience—of throwing incense into a charcoal fire to drive away demons, mistook the throwing of incense into the camp-fire for a like charm, and regarded it as a sign of the presence of the demon."

Wolff was thoroughly convinced of the reality of demoniacal possessions as a not infrequent malady among the heathen. Ac-

cordingly he relates the above occurrence, unaccompanied with those testimonies and reasons which the skeptical might consider that they have the right to demand.

Mr. Ellis, in "Polynesian Researches" (Vol. I., p. 273), gives an account of a Sandwich Island priest who imagined that a divinity had taken possession of him. The muscles of the limbs were convulsed, the body swelled, the features were horribly distorted, and the eyes wild and strained. He often rolled on the ground, foaming at the mouth, and then, in shrill cries, made declarations which were regarded as the utterances of the divinity.

When incantations were performed by sorcerers, the most acute agonies and terrific distortions of the body were often experienced. The wretched sufferer appeared in a state of frantic madness, or, as they expressed it, torn by the evil spirit, while he foamed and writhed under the dreadful power.

Two boys were cursed by a sorcerer. The effect upon one of them is described by the missionaries who were sent for. They found him lying on the ground, writhing in anguish, foaming at the mouth, his eyes starting from their sockets, his face distorted, his limbs violently convulsed. He soon afterwards expired in intense agony.

W. Knighton, Esq., who was a magistrate in Oudh, India, contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* for October, 1880, a paper on "Demoniacal Possessions in India."

He regards the belief on this subject, almost universally entertained in India, as a foul superstition. The better educated generally have no faith in it. The supposed possessions, according to the writer, seem to be confined to idiots, hysterics, epileptics, the insane, and those extremely nervous persons whose sympathies impel them to share the maladies of those with whom they are brought in contact. The exorcisms consist in shouting, beating of drums, objurgations, etc. But the extreme resort, and that frequently found to be efficacious, is beating the patient and other acts of personal violence, with greater or less severity, according to the obstinacy of the supposed demon.

There can be no doubt that the cures effected in this manner should be regarded as a species of mind or will cure. The patient, in order to obtain relief from the tortures to which he is subjected, brings will power to bear with such energy as to dispel the disorder. A case is related in which not only the subject and her husband, but the whole community, were convinced of the demoniacal character of the pos-

session and the efficacy of the exorcism. It was that of an active, intelligent, well-formed woman, who upon the death of her father and mother sank into melancholy. She had no children, and was believed to be possessed. She was sullen, took no interest in anything, and at length became dumb—at least she did not and could not be induced to speak. But as the result of a heroic and most inhuman treatment on the part of the exorcist, the dumb patient shrieked and spoke, was convulsed, became insensible, and the "Devil" was driven out. In three days she returned to her husband, a well woman.

It is needless to add that such exorcisms were not always successful; but they appear to have been effective in cases where the will was more powerful than the disease.

While this example and that from the Shanars may not be sufficient to establish the reality of demoniacal possessions in those countries, yet in another chapter will appear some testimony from India, bearing more directly upon that point.

CHAPTER XVI.

DIABOLISM AND LUNACY.

What, then, is a "possession" of the devil! In those physical possessions mentioned in the New Testament there was not merely a conflict of impulses or inclinations,—reason and conscience on the one side, and disposition on the other, which is the case in all allurements to sin, but there was another power than the person himself; not a mere influence which by strength of will he could and ought to control, but a power that took possession of him and led him where it would, in spite of himself. It was as though another and stronger being had seized him and carried him at will. It was sometimes a possession of the person's organs of speech, even, compelling him to say what the demon would. And yet that person could speak for himself also, and sometimes did so. It was as though there were two beings in one body—the individual himself was there, and the demon also.

Nor was this, as might be conjectured,

merely another form of insanity. Not only is the insane person the victim of delusions, but there is an impulse, apparently irresistible, to say and do what the individual knows to be absurd, unreasonable, or wrong. We believe it is now established that there is an undercurrent of sound reason; and the mode of dealing with the insane is not, as in former times, to humor the delusion or the erratic impulses, but to discourage them, to dissipate the delusion by an appeal to the person's self-respect, his sense of propriety.

These, however, are indications of a disease. Insanity is a disease, as much so as consumption. And as Satan takes advantage of our weaknesses of character, making them his particular points of assault, so also may he do the same by our bodily infirmities. Thus in Matt. ix. 32, there is a dumb person possessed of the Devil; and in Matt. xii. 22, one that was dumb and blind; then in Matt. xvii. 14–21, Mark ix. 14–29, Luke ix. 37–42, one that was lunatic, and the subject of epileptic fits.

As Satan has power to assail persons, whether mentally or morally weak, and does so, bending them to his purpose, so we may not doubt his power to assail persons with constitutional, bodily infirmities. And furthermore, as to the union of disease with spiritual

possession, Bishop Bloomfield very pertinently says (Note on Matt. iv. 24.): "When it is urged that in the demoniacs no symptoms are recorded which do not coincide with those of epilepsy or insanity at the present day, we may ask, if an evil spirit were permitted to disturb men's vital functions, have we any conception how this could be done *without* occasioning some or other of the symptoms which accompany natural disease?"

As, then, Satan assaults us through our moral infirmities—the tendencies of our fallen nature—so does he also in our other weaknesses, such as sickness, pain, grief, etc., etc.

The Christian recognizes the duty of not yielding to petulance in some kinds of sickness, nor to murmuring against Providence, but to cultivate submission and fortitude in pain and all bodily suffering. Here Satan, taking advantage of bodily weakness tempts us to sin. It was the trial of Job to be impatient, and to "curse God" in his trials.

In dementia there is more or less of disorder and disarrangement of the faculties. It would be natural to suppose that a person whose mind is so affected that he cannot control his conduct would be apt to act spontaneously, as he had been accustomed to do, particularly when under no restraint. But this is not al-

ways the case. Here is the case of a person whose conduct is strange and unaccountable. He is the victim of delusions. He is at times wild and fierce beyond control. In addition to this, not only is his language vile and blasphemous, but untruthful. He commits theft, incendiarism, and endeavors to commit murder. An ecclesiastic who has not kept pace with the advance of modern science pronounces this a case of unquestionable diabolical possession. The scientist disputes it. At length the patient dies. There is an autopsy. The scientist proves that the brain was diseased. The theologian acknowledges the fact, and the case is set down as one of lunacy.

The ecclesiastic, however, reasons in this manner: In the case of men in perfect health, where there is no derangement, Satan does operate upon the faculties and emotions, leading into sin by influencing them. Justifiable anger he makes sinful by tempting to excess; the lawful desire for accumulation, by tempting to greed and covetousness, and the like. Now if a person of sound mind can thus be led astray by the author of evil, how much more is one likely to become a victim when his mind has become enfeebled and disordered, and is on that account less under the control of the will and the conscience. We are there-

fore led to the conclusion that, as Satan is the author of all blasphemy, all lewdness, all infamy of whatever kind, so taking advantage of the weakness of the patient, he induces to acts of impiety. The disordered mind may not have been *due* to a diabolical possession, but *being disordered* and weak, Satan infuses the wickedness.

This brings us to a consideration of the difference between pure lunacy and actual demoniacal possession.

Satan may indeed seize upon a lunatic, taking advantage of his physical weakness; and we may be at a loss where to draw the line between the physical and the spiritual; the disease and the possession are so strongly blended. But where there is a clear case of health, the demoniacal possession is more readily identified. The case is thus stated by Mr. William Gilbert in "Good Words," copied into the *Living Age* of March 9, 1867.

"I think it is evident that a certain abnormal state of mind exists which is not insanity according to the legal definition of the term. It is a state unaffected, so far as science can prove, by any physical condition of the body; on which medicine appears to have no effect, and on which religion alone seems to exercise any beneficial control."

The same writer remarks: "A marked difference may be discerned between the demoniac and the lunatic. A madman never acknowledges himself to be insane. The supposed demoniac, on the contrary, while firmly insisting that he is in his right senses, fully believes himself to have been impelled to the commission of his crime by the influence of some power he was unable to withstand. Nothing is more common than to find persons in our prisons, laboring under this conviction. Mrs. Meredith, the honorary secretary of the female branch of the Prisoners' Aid Society,—a lady who has had great experience among our female convicts, having been appointed by the Government to visit the women confined in the Brixton Prison—assures me that it is very common to find among them those who readily admit the crime for which they have been incarcerated, as well as the enormity of their sin. Such persons will allow that they were fully convinced of its wickedness at the time of its perpetration, and yet they will insist that they had not, at the moment, power to control themselves. During their imprisonment they will even frequently burst out into uncontrollable fits of violence, without the least provocation, and at the same time use the most blasphemous language. When, however, the

attack is over, they calmly admit they were fully aware of their outrageous and causeless behavior, and insist that they were impelled to it by the Devil. Many of them, indeed, are perfectly well aware when an attack is pending, and will frequently tell the warder, in their own phraseology, that they are sorry to say they feel that a 'break out' is coming on.

"One extraordinary feature in the case is the almost supernatural strength, women breaking with their own hands an iron bedstead in pieces, wrenching iron bars from their fastenings in stone; tearing up the floor with their own hands, things which the strongest men could not do, and yet which these women confess to be easy, in their paroxysms. Another feature is an uncontrollable spirit of evil, not only in language, but sometimes committing the most revolting murders, upon persons against whom they have no cause for ill-will, and sometimes to whom they are devotedly attached—mothers even turning upon their own children. Another marked difference between these cases and lunacy is that, while in the latter case prayer seems only to have a sedative influence, yet in the former its power is very great, sometimes effecting a cure—driving the demon out."

I have known, in my own experience, an

instance which I always regarded as a demoniacal possession. A poor woman, an excellent wife and mother, an agreeable neighbor, and moreover a devout and consistent Christian; a Methodist, but of the more quiet and less demonstrative kind, who regularly attended upon her religious duties. This woman was at times seized with certain paroxysms, in which she manifested a character strikingly opposite to her usual temper. She would, from morning to night, and all the night through, indulge in most coarse and vulgar language, heap oaths upon oaths, and abuse upon relatives and friends, conducting like a most brutal criminal, except that she never resorted to personal violence. Many a time in the dead of night have I been awakened by her coarse and blasphemous ravings. This would sometimes continue for two or three weeks together. The paroxysm would then pass off, and she would return to her ordinary quiet and exemplary life.

The general conclusions to which the author has arrived are corroborated by the experience of a gentleman widely known for his scholarship and medical and legal attainments, qualifying him for the position he formerly occupied as Commissioner of Lunacy for the State of New York, and that which he now holds as

Lecturer on Medical Jurisprudence in several of the prominent institutions of learning in the country. In a conversation with him on the subject of this volume, he expressed the conviction that there is a marked difference between diabolism and lunacy. He said in substance:

There is in the possessed a wickedness which it is a slander upon the animal creation to call brutal,—for brutes are kind to their mates and their offspring. There is a vileness and lust, a blood-thirstiness and cruelty surpassing conception: murdering members of one's own family; seizing an infant, and dashing out its brains; disembowelling its victim.

Here is one case: a shoemaker, a man of some education, who had read much; had read infidel works, and was himself an infidel, enticed a married woman to live with him as his wife. When her husband, who had been to California, returned, she went back to him. The shoemaker, having obtained an interview, sprang upon her with his knife, cut and slashed her face, her breasts, her person, in a most diabolical manner. Having thus murdered her, he turned upon and cut himself in a similar manner, and ended the tragedy by cutting his own throat.

Another instance illustrates the difference

between lunacy and diabolism, and also shows how the two may co-exist.

A lady, the wife of a distinguished divine, became insane, and was confined in an asylum. She was a pious and cultured woman, pure and modest; and yet she would sometimes break forth in fits of profaneness, and of the vilest vulgarity and abuse. When these spasms were coming upon her she would become restless and wander about her room as if seeking some retreat or some means of exit. Then she would become more uneasy, and act as if fighting a foe; sometimes striking her fist with great violence against the wall, bruising herself. She would next begin swaying her person and tossing her arms about; then break out in her coarse and profane invectives against acquaintances and friends. This would continue for some time, until she became completely exhausted.

During the spasm she was unconscious, or rather, on recovery had no recollection of what had taken place except as to the beginning of the outbreak. Of this her memory was distinct and clear. She said that as she felt it coming on she was conscious of moving about, seeking to find something against which she could lean for support in an assault. Then the feeling was as though a gust of wind was

coming down upon her, filling her to the full. It would next seem to sweep and whirl her about as a blast. She was in conflict with a storm. An uncontrollable influence compelled her to speak as she did. An exterior power possessed her. When all this had passed she would sink down utterly exhausted. Then would come floods of weeping over what she had spoken, the beginnings of which only were impressed upon her mind. She would beg forgiveness of her friends, imploring them not to let her husband know what had taken place.

In cases of demoniacal possession the victim is conscious of the presence of a will-power not his own. He is sometimes impelled to do that which in his very soul he abhors—which is to him most revolting. But how are we to classify cases of utter depravity, where the transgressor has been led on by degrees from one misdeed to another, or has abandoned himself without any restraint, and apparently without compunction, to most revolting wickedness; and instead of the consciousness of being impelled by a will not his own, he actually glories in his depravity? His moral nature seems to be totally reversed. What is good is to him evil, and what is evil is to him good. The criminal world abounds in instances of the kind.

CHAPTER XVII.

NECROMANCY, MODERN SPIRITUALISM, AND SUPRA-NATURAL FORCES.

THE apparent phenomena of spiritualism are either delusive or real. If real, the manifestations are due to one of two causes, either some force in the ordinary course of nature, the laws and principles of which are not as yet understood, or to some supra-natural cause.

The latter view is that entertained by the disciples of modern spiritualism. They hold that the spirits of the departed have actually, under certain conditions, a limited intercourse with the living. The ground for this belief is that communications are said to be received in the way of information, answers to questions, literary productions, discourses, etc., corresponding to the personal characteristics, attainments, and former position of the party from whom they are supposed to be received.

If it were established beyond question that such communications came from some intelli-

gent source beyond what is recognized as in the course of nature, the next inquiry properly is, what is that source? It is certainly intelligent, and is not human. It is then a spirit. It is a fair inference that it is either the spirit of the departed or some other spirit which has intelligence, such as the departed possessed.

The solution of the problem—natural causes aside—requires one of these two theories. In support of the latter we have the authority of Scripture for the belief in disembodied spirits. There are good angels and fallen angels. There are good spirits and bad. Both kinds have in times past had communications with men. Satan, as a deceiver, sometimes "is transformed into an angel of light." His power of deception must therefore be very great. Holding intercourse with men, if wishing to deceive them there is but one possible course for him to pursue: make communications which would have enough of truth and virtue or the semblance of truth and virtue in them to appear good; plausible theories and doctrines which innocently received would yet be subversive of sound principles. We read of "lying spirits," which in the name of the Lord actually did prophesy falsely; and which in judgment upon those He wished to destroy God did not restrain from doing so. In the Hebrew style of

expression they were said to be "lying spirits from the Lord."

If, then, what are known as spiritual manifestations are not all a fraud, they come from some disembodied intelligences or spirits. That is to say—just as in ancient days disembodied spirits did hold communications with men, so they do now. But among them are lying spirits. There is therefore no plausible reason for doubting that Satan, who is sometimes "transformed into an angel of light," is capable, through his lying spirits, of personating deceased friends, and in that capacity deluding, through pretended communications from them. Without here asserting that he actually does this, we claim that, on the supposition that these manifestations are real, here are two theories to account for them, one that they are actual communications from departed persons, the other that they are deceptions perpetrated by evil spirits.

Of these two theories there is one strong argument in favor of the latter, viz.: that necromancy, or communications with the departed, real or supposed, are forbidden in Scripture. If the so-called communications do not come from the dead, but from evil spirits who counterfeit them,* such prohibition is accounted for.

* Rev. xvi. 14: "The spirits of devils working miracles."

But is not all this modern spiritual manifestation doctrine a fraud? One whom you may have known for years, whose integrity it may be impossible to question, may astonish you with a narrative of what he has seen and heard, and which, without the shadow of a doubt, he regards as the work of the spirits of the deceased. He heard the sounds. "No trickery," he says, "could possibly have produced them, for the medium was put to the severest test." How often are we brought to face such positive and unqualified statements! They whose memory goes back to the early days of the "Rochester rappings" under the auspices of the Fox girls can bear abundant testimony to like experience. Unless the writer is greatly mistaken, it was not before, but after these rappings that modern spiritualism took its rise. Until then nothing had been heard of departed spirits communicating with the living by means of "raps." And yet at the Academy of Music in New York, in 1889, Mrs. Kane, the original Margaret Fox, confessed before a large audience that the Rochester rappings were a fraud from the beginning; that she and her sister had been guilty of imposing upon the people. She thereupon produced the rappings in all their variety and explained how the trick was done.

But this exposure has not ended spiritualism. Its disciples are numbered by hundreds of thousands, and the particular phenomena of rappings and table-turnings are still vouched for by persons whose integrity is beyond question. If deceived, they are at least honest. But may not certain audible and visible manifestations be due to other than supra-natural causes, having no real connection with what is called spiritualism? May not the one be a fact in nature lately brought into prominence? and is the other entirely a delusion?

That there are, not known in nature, forces which are directed by some intelligent agent, the following narratives clearly prove. Either the events did actually take place as described, or we must reject testimony which any judge or jury would accept without hesitation in attestation of any fact not so marvellous.

The narrative rests upon the testimony of the family of which John Wesley was a member. The witnesses were the Rev. Mr. Wesley, Mrs. Wesley, the father and mother of John, Susannah, Emilia, and Mary Wesley, his sisters, the Rev. Mr. Hoole, a neighboring clergyman, and Robin Brown, a man-servant in the family. All these were witnesses of the phenomena at Epworth. The statements were given in the handwriting of some of the par-

ties just named. They are in letters still in existence, and were written in answer to inquiries from astonished neighbors and friends, and from men of learning, piety, and science. John Wesley, the great founder of Methodism, investigated the subject very closely, accepted the facts of the case, and wrote and published an account of them in the *Arminian Magazine*. It was at the close of the year 1715. John, then twelve years of age, was at school at Charterhouse in London.

Strange noises were heard in the house of the Wesleys at Epworth—noises like the groans of a person in deep distress. They were at first heard by a maid-servant, who was simply laughed at. But, a few nights afterwards, the whole family began to hear strange knockings—three or four at a time, in different parts of the house. As the only person who did not hear them was the father, the Rev. Mr. Wesley, the family feared that they foreboded some calamity to the head of the house. He was at length informed, but regarded the whole matter as the prank of some mischievous person. The sounds still increased in strange variety and intensity: "Loud rumblings above stairs and below; a clatter among a number of bottles as though they had all at one time been dashed to pieces;

footsteps, as of a man going up and down stairs at all hours of the night; sounds like that of dancing in an empty room, the door of which was locked; gabbling like a turkey cock; but more frequently a knocking about the beds at night, and in different parts of the house." *

At length the Rev. Mr. Wesley himself was disturbed. About midnight, from a room adjoining his sleeping apartment, came nine loud and distinct knocks, with a pause after every three. He rose to investigate, but could find nothing. A stout mastiff guarded the house, and Mr. Wesley thought that a sufficient protection against any intruding mischief-makers. But the dog, who at the commencement of the knockings had barked violently, soon cowed down in abject fear; and thereafter, in all the disturbances, showed himself more timid than any of the family. The man-servant took the animal to his own room, but the moment the noises began "the dog crept into the bed and barked and howled so as to alarm the whole house." †

Still fearing that these disturbances might have some mysterious connection with the welfare of some of the family, they became

* Southey's "Life of Wesley," Am. ed., Vol. I., pp. 64, 65.
† Ibid, p. 65.

greatly apprehensive as to the eldest son, Samuel, who was then absent. But, having heard of his safety, they became accustomed to the phenomena, felt more curiosity than alarm, and in jest they nicknamed the supposed author of these noises, "Old Jeffery."

Mrs. Wesley, the mother, was very incredulous as to the supernatural disturbances; but at length yielded the point, and came to the conviction that their origin was from some spiritual cause. This change in her views came about in this way: unable to assign any plausible reason for the occurrences which had so disturbed her household, and wondering if it could possibly be, as some neighbors suggested, that rats had some share in them, she caused a horn to be blown loudly in every part of the house, having been told that that method would be most effectual in driving rats from the premises. Up to that time the noises had been heard only at night; but now they came by day also, and were louder than before.

One night, when the noises were apparent in the nursery, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley entered with a view to quieting the fears of the children. So indignant was the venerable divine that the children should be molested, that he had no hesitation in concluding that the author

was a malicious demon, and accordingly rebuked it, calling it a dumb and deaf devil, adjuring it to depart or come to his study if he had anything to say. Just as if Old Jeffery was a real person, and now considered himself defied, the noises now began in the Rector's study. No other person ever felt the goblin; but the clergyman gives his testimony that he "was twice pushed by it with considerable force."

I quote now from the narrative as given by Southey:

"The door was once violently pushed against Emilia (one of the sisters); the latches were frequently lifted up; the windows clattered, always before Jeffery entered the room, and whatever iron or brass was there, rung and jarred exceedingly. It was observed also that the wind commonly rose after any of his noises and increased with it, and whistled loudly around the house. Mr. Wesley's trencher danced one day upon the table, to his no small amazement; and the handle of Robin's hand-mill at another time was turned round with great swiftness." *

As to the children:

"When the noises began they appeared to be frightened in their sleep; a sweat came over

* Southey's "Life of Wesley," Am. ed., Vol. I., pp. 66, 67.

them, and they panted and trembled till the disturbance was so loud as to awaken them."*

These are the main points of a narrative which, though founded upon unimpeachable testimony, yet presents some features so marvellous as to invite a few words of comment.

The poet Southey, from whose "Life of Wesley" these facts are gathered, says: "An author who in this age relates such a story, and treats it as not utterly incredible and absurd, must expect to be ridiculed; but the testimony upon which it rests is far too strong to be set aside because of the strangeness of the relation."

The *facts* were thoroughly sifted at the time, and as to them there can be no question. The question is as to their cause. The celebrated Dr. Priestly made an investigation and pronounced the whole thing as a very clever trick of some mischievous person. The facts, however, hardly seem to admit of such an explanation. And a person so clever as to deceive witnesses learned and ignorant, skeptical as well as credulous, and all of them in good repute for sobriety and integrity—such a trickster must be desperately blind to his own interests to hide his talents in obscurity, when a public display of his powers would be sure

* Southey's "Life of Wesley," Am. ed., Vol. I., p. 67.

to place him at the head of artists in legerdemain.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge has a very singular theory to account for the phenomena. He says:

"All these stories—and I could produce fifty at least, well authenticated (and as far as the veracity of the narrators and the simple fact of their having seen and heard such sights or sounds,—above all rational skepticism)—are as much like one another as the symptoms of the same disease in different patients. And this indeed I take to be the true and only solution—a contagious nervous disease, the acme or intensest form of which is catalepsy." To this the distinguished author adds an N.B. "Dogs are often seen to *catch* fear from their owners."

This theory would no doubt explain some remarkable phenomena which have puzzled scientists, such for example as the "Kentucky Jerks" which created quite a sensation some years ago. A contagious nervous disease may also possibly have had something to do with certain cases in the time of New England witchcraft. But these affect muscular action and bodily movements. But nothing of the kind appears in the phenomena in the parsonage at Epworth. These include only what

persons heard and saw and felt as the apparent result of some invisible force around them, acting oftentimes upon inanimate matter. The limbs or bodies of the persons themselves were not affected.

The explanation of the manifestations at Epworth—if it can be called an explanation—undoubtedly is that they were caused by the action of some force unknown to our philosophy. Should it ever become known, so far that we can understand the laws of its operation, philosophers will give it a name, and then they will understand it as much as they do another force to which they give the name of "gravity." What gravity *is* is probably one of the unknowable things. But with regard to the force exerted in the disturbances in the house of the Wesleys, there is an additional mystery It must either have been intelligent itself, or under the direction of some intelligence. And what was that?

Without pausing to answer this question now, let us pass on to some other marvellous phenomena, also well attested, and in which we shall find something like—if not the identical occult force whose operations have interested us.

Louis Jacolliot, the Chief Justice of Chandenagua (French East Indies), was led to inves-

tigate some of the extraordinary phenomena exhibited through the medium of the fakirs of India. This gentleman was not merely a high official in the service of the French Government, but a scholar of varied attainments, a devotee of science, but withal a thorough skeptic both in religion, and as to anything outside of what is commonly regarded as the usual course of nature. He has no belief in the supernatural whatever, or under any circumstances.

In relating what he saw, this functionary declares his intention not to advance any theory by way of explanation. But as the fakirs claimed that their performances were supernatural, and as the marvels were so great that Jacolliot must either admit the supernatural, or conjecture some other cause, he does so far depart from his resolution as to attribute what he saw to the operation of some force in nature which science has not yet investigated, and which is consequently unknown to our philosophy. As to the supposition of fraud, he lays down ten conditions which usually accompany the sleight-of-hand exhibitions to which we are accustomed, every one of which is absent in the performances of the fakirs. He says: "We are bound to say, however, as impartial and faithful observers,

that, though we applied the severest tests—to which the fakirs and other initiates interposed no objection whatever—we never succeeded in detecting a single case of fraud or trickery."

Without further introduction I proceed to state that, in the presence of the Chief Justice, sat upon the ground a fakir entirely nude (except a very small cloth about the waist), having no implements whatever except a bamboo stick about the size of a pencil. Several small earthen flower-pots were placed at a distance of about six feet from the performer. In these were inserted, not by the fakir, but by his direction, short, slender, upright sticks, and on each stick was placed a leaf with a hole in the middle. The leaves dropped, covering the pots. The fakir then invoked the harmless spirits. Whereupon, the Chief Justice says, "suddenly it seemed to me that my hair was moved by a slight current of air which blew in my face." Yet the curtains in the room were not moved. Soon the leaves upon the sticks began to rise and fall. The Chief Justice walked between the fakir and the pots, but the phenomena continued. He then, with his own hand, put away all the pots and their contents, and rearranged the whole paraphernalia. But the result was the same. Up to this point the performance was simply a very

curious phenomenon which others had noted, but of which no explanation has ever been given. But now the fakir asked his honor if he had any question to ask, and the spirits would answer it. He then as a test thought of a friend who had died twenty years before, whose name he had not mentioned, and of whose very existence all around him were ignorant. The answer which the dancing leaves gave to this merely mental question was, "Albain Brunier died at Bourg-en-Bresse (Ain), January 3d, 1856." Says the writer: "The name, the date, the place, everything was correct. The blood rushed to my head as I read over and over again the words which shone strangely in my eyes. What made my astonishment greater, I had no conception of phenomena of this class. I was totally unprepared for them."

During *fifteen days* our authority subjected this fakir to the most severe tests,—to which he submitted with the utmost readiness. Amongst other exploits, "he lowered one balance of a pair of scales simply with a peacock's feather, when the other balance contained a weight of about one hundred and twenty pounds. By mere imposition of hands he made a crown of flowers float in the air; the atmosphere was filled with vague and indis-

tinct sounds, and a shadowy hand drew luminous figures in space."

The performances of another fakir were, if possible, still more wonderful. There was an immense bronze vase, which when empty could hardly be removed by two men. It was now filled with water, and was standing several feet from the performer, and at his motion rocked gently to and fro and approached him, and at intervals distinct sounds escaped from it, as if struck by a steel hammer. Jacolliot himself now gave directions to the vase, and it advanced and receded according to his requirements. At his command the blows increased in rapidity, until they resembled the roll of a drum; then they accorded with the tick of a clock; then they struck every ten seconds precisely, measured by the watch. They kept time to a tune played by a mechanical music-box. The vase, at the touch of the fakir, with gradually increasing speed spun about the room. It rose at a distance of seven or eight inches from the pavement, and when it fell made no sound. On the following day, the vase being filled with water to the very edge, it was caused to assume the appearance of boiling violently. Sometimes the waves rose to the height of one and two feet.

As to an explanation of these and many like

phenomena recorded by the same author, Jacolliot repeatedly denies that he has any belief in spirits as the authors of such wonders, but he repeats this denial so many times and so emphatically that one is tempted to suspect that he does believe in them more than he himself is aware. But he ascribes all to some force in nature, known to certain classes of Hindus alone. According to them there is a force of this kind which it would be out of place to consider here, and which I dismiss with the remark that it involves the existence of that which is recognized generally in modern philosophy, the ethereal fluid which pervades all space.

The fakirs themselves claim to be invested with supernatural powers: that all these marvels are wrought by spirits, whom they have the power of calling to their presence.

In other words, they are demons, according to the belief of all Hindus. The Greek word *δαίμων* means a spirit, whether good or bad. The *κακοῖ δαίμωνες* only are evil spirits. But the demoniacal possessions with which we are made acquainted in Scripture are of evil spirits. Is there an order of spirits between good and evil angels? Are there demons who are not good angels and yet are not essentially bad? The damsel at Philippi, of whom S.

Paul speaks as having a spirit of divination, was her spirit one of these? Did the invisible author or authors of the commotions at Epworth and in India belong to this class? Were the, so to style them, "familiar spirits" evoked by the fakirs of the same order?

The Rev. Dr. Austin Phelps, late Professor of Homiletics at Andover, gives his testimony to occurrences like those at Epworth in the house of his own father in Stratford, Connecticut. They establish the fact of spiritualism in one form, and the possibility of a darker and more dangerous diabolism. The force thus brought to light differs from what is manifest in hypnotism, not being dependent for its direction upon the will or mental action of any living human being.

After conversations with intelligent and conscientious individuals who have had personal acquaintance and experience with the phenomenon called spiritualism, I have arrived at the following conclusions, viz.:

I. That spiritual beings of the unseen world have under certain conditions made their existence and presence manifest.

II. That it is in the highest degree doubtful whether such spirits are those of human beings, especially of those whom they personate. This is not denying the possibility of such

communications and appearances as in the case of Samuel with the Witch of Endor, and in the Transfiguration scene.

III. The testimony of the most intelligent and reliable persons with whom I have conversed, and who are believers in spiritualism, is to the effect that, notwithstanding all its marvellousness and weird romance, it serves no practical purpose, accomplishes no good, but has done any amount of evil in its effect upon the intellect, upon the faith, and upon morals.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OCCULT ARTS, MAGIC, SORCERY, ETC.

THERE is a veil that separates all unseen, both good and bad, from the seen powers. Beyond that veil we do not pass except at death. Nay, more, until that event, to pass the boundary is prohibited. With the intelligences beyond that limit we are forbidden to hold intercourse. Such occult arts as necromancy, magic, sorcery, or divination are a trespass upon this forbidden ground. The possibility and the fact of such trespass is clear from the prohibitory laws of the old dispensation; from the condemnations, expressed and implied, in the new; and from the fact that they who dealt in such arts, on becoming converted to the faith renounced them, destroyed their implements, and at Ephesus the converts burned their books at a sacrifice of fifty thousand pieces of silver, estimated at £1,350, or about $6,750 in value.

In the early Christian Church, and for centuries, everything coming under the denomi-

nation of the occult arts was put under the ban. The apostolic constitutions forbade baptism to astrologers, and condemned all kinds of fortune-tellers, soothsayers, diviners by lots or otherwise. All kinds of divination were looked upon as originating from wicked spirits. Eusebius, Bishop of Emisa, was condemned for the practice of astrology. The councils of Laodicea and of Ancyra, Augustine, Lactantius, Tertullian, Eusebius, Origen, and others condemned it.

Tertullian observes that "never was a magician or enchanter allowed to escape unpunished in the Church." S. Chrysostom is very full and clear in his denunciation of all kinds of curious arts, of whatever name or description. "Christians had better die than be cured by any of them." The Church often, says Bingham, cured diseases, dispossessed devils, and wrought miracles; but never by resort to any occult art, nor by invocation of angels, but always by prayer to God, pure, clean, and open.

What was thus forbidden by express enactment under the old dispensation, denounced by inspired writers of the new, renounced and abandoned as iniquitous by the converts from heathenism, and everywhere condemned by the early Church, was no mere chimera, but a dark and diabolical reality.

It has never been entirely obliterated, but has been present, to a greater or less extent, in heathenism of all ages. The forces with which it deals have occasionally, unsought, made their presence felt in Christian lands; and particularly of late, lurking under the skirts of skepticism, have obtruded their presence to the peril of the unwary.

There is a class of forces or powers which may be called occult, as being until of late unknown, or at least unrecognized by philosophers and scientists, and which are now the subject of investigation. If, however, they were known to the magicians of ancient times, and were under their control, it may readily be conceived that they may have been employed in the practice of "curious arts."

When in the advancement of learning the mind of man had broken away from the thraldom of superstition, and had been taught practical and most necessary principles in the art of reasoning, ghosts, apparitions, magic, and sorcery were relegated to the region of the incredible. Yet there would occur cases of hallucinations and spectres, and sages as well as others would see them. A theory to account for them has been devised and generally accepted. But in close connection with these is that for which no solution has been found out-

side of the forces of the invisible universe. I mean this fact—that of such appearances identical with the moment of some startling event or calamity connected with the person whose spectre appears. Hundreds of such facts, accepted as such and recorded in works of eminent and trustworthy writers, have occurred.

The phenomena last mentioned appear to be under no control or direction. They come or they go at will. But those skilled in occult arts claim to know and possess the power to produce the conditions under which these apparitions become manifest.

There is another class of phenomena, the result of forces the employment of which we are not now pronouncing unlawful. In themselves they might be innocent, and because unknown to any but magicians, might have been used by them to earn credit for miraculous power and for intercourse with spirits of the unseen world. But it may be a question whether they may not constitute, as it were, a bridge spanning and affording a passage over that chasm which lies between the lawful and the forbidden.

After a hundred years of battling with rebuff, humiliation, and scorn, hypnotism has at length fairly won a recognition from philosophers and scientists. It has won this, not

by argument, but by producing unquestionable facts. It is no longer a theory, no longer a mere experiment. It has found acceptance among medical and scientific associations which once scouted it as a contemptible imposture. It is established and practiced in some of the leading medical institutions in France.

Under its influence a person may become simply a machine, entirely under the control of another; to say and do what the operator bids, to experience what sensations, see what sights and hear what sounds the operator may require;—all this being to the patient just as evident and perceptible as though the sights and sounds and emotions were real instead of delusions. The patient in this condition can be made to commit theft, forgery, perjury, or any other crime, attempt at murder not excepted.

Not only this, but the hypnotist may name a certain act to be done—it may be a crime—at a certain place, on a certain day and appointed hour after the somnambulism shall have passed away;—leaving, with this exception, every faculty and power in the normal condition. But the designated hour and moment arrive. The victim is led on by an impulse which he cannot understand, and which

he feels unable to resist, to do precisely the deed required and precisely in the manner prescribed. The patient all the while may be an honest layman, an exemplary dignitary of the Church, or a devout representative of an order of deaconesses or a sister of mercy and charity.

All that is here stated has been proved by incontestable testimony, and can be established to the satisfaction of any person who will take the time, the trouble, and proper means of verification.

It is certainly to this generation a new order of things. We stand before it as something supra-natural. But whatever it is, we must face it and ascertain whether it has come upon us for evil or for good—whether, like some other awful and terrible forces, its operation can be controlled and regulated and society can be protected against its abuse.

In hospitals and other institutions where, under the direction of honorable, learned, and skilful practitioners, hypnotism is employed as a remedial agent, it is made to act as an anæsthetic. Some of the most painful operations are performed upon subjects in a state of unconsciousness. It is beneficially applied in all nervous disorders. It cures insomnia, etc.

Let us give this newly developed power

credit for all the benefit it may instrumentally achieve, it is still a most fearful power for evil. The good citizen, to say nothing of the devout Christian, has the moral strength to resist temptation to crimes. But here is a power which is not a temptation. It is a force which has all the strength of a powerful machine. The governing lever may be in the hands of a most unprincipled, unscrupulous, and heartless villain, who, having gained control, compels his victim coolly and deliberately —as though it were evidently the most proper act in the world—to do a deed which would consign him to infamy, send him to the dungeon and the gallows. The law holds the perpetrator responsible and condemns him to punishment for his crime; while all the while he is innocent, being irresponsible; for the deed is instigated, and—using the innocent as an instrument—perpetrated by another. That other, when we say of him that he is unprincipled, unscrupulous, and heartless, we feel that we have not exhausted the expressive epithets until we have added one more—diabolical. The deed is too base to be charged upon even fallen humanity. The villain is the willing instrument of the prime instigator, —Satan.

May it not be that here (if not in the hyp-

notic power itself, yet in its manipulation) was one of those "curious arts" which were known at Ephesus where, at the preaching and miracles of S. Paul, those who used them "brought their books together and burned them before all men?"

One is the more tempted to ask such a question as this when he considers that adepts in hypnotism are of opinion that this is not a new discovery, but a revival of what was known in ages long past. Dr. Luys, a distinguished Paris physician, a member of the Academy of Medicine and physician to La Charité Hospitale, says: "In reality, hypnotism is found under different names at all periods of history, from the incantations of the ancient Egyptian magicians, down to the fascinations of Mesmer, and the investigations of Braid."

Whether this power itself, aside from its abuse, be diabolical or not, the operator, like the magician of old, can wield it for diabolical purposes. The effectual safeguard against its power for evil is in the counter agency of the Holy Spirit.

While the writers upon hypnotism are very positive in their statements as to complete personal subjection, yet, following them closely, one is led to perceive that this, when attained, is due in great measure to the volun-

tary surrender on the part of the hypnotized. He is first willing, or at least not unwilling, to be hypnotized. Then, when the operator would lead him to do what is abhorrent to nature, to humanity, to morals, he meets with a resistance proportionate to the culture, the attainments, and the conscientiousness of the patient.

Thus, let the patient be required to do something ridiculous or absurd, and note the action. Say to a subject, "In five minutes after waking you will ask for a glass of water," and it turns out exactly as dictated. But try upon three or four persons this experiment: say, "In five minutes after waking you will place this chair upon the table;" and one person will stand as one puzzled; will look at the chair, will look at the table, will take hold of the chair, and at length place it upon the table, and laughing, say, "I do not know what strange freak seized me that I should do this." Another will perform the act without hesitation, and then exhibit marks of chagrin at having acted absurdly. A third, with a strong sense of dignity and of propriety, will simply not do it. He will feel the impulse all the same, and wonder that he feels it. He will go out, shut the door, leave the house, feeling all the while the impulse to go back and

do the absurd thing. In time the influence wears off.

We can see at once the bearing of this upon the question of personal responsibility. However profound the hypnotic slumber may be, however absolute the control of the hypnotizer, there seems ground for belief that there is still a residuum of individuality. For, while a person of low morality may be induced to commit crime without hesitation, yet a conscientious person, if he become so overpowered as to yield to the suggestion, does so with reluctance, with violent struggle, so that when restored to his normal condition he is exhausted and feels that he has gone through a conflict. On the other hand, persons of extreme conscientiousness and deep piety have in themselves a spirit which is proof against any suggestion to wrong.

Dr. Ford says that, "Even during profound hypnotic sleep a struggle may occur between a suggestion and the individuality of the hypnotized. Not every suggestion is accepted." In the same connection he says: "A violent struggle will arise between the force of the suggestion, on the one hand, and the associated æsthetic or ethical contra-conceptions of the normal individuality, *i.e.*, of the inherited and acquired cerebral dynamisms, on the other

hand. This struggle will be so much more violent the more powerfully these contra-conceptions and the suggestibility are developed. *The stronger the antagonistic forces, the more violent will the struggle be. Its termination will depend upon the intensity and the endurance of each of these forces.*"

It would seem as though a voice directly from the other world could not more articulately declare to us that our only safety from the snares, the traps, the machinations, and the determined malice and hatred of the Devil lies in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, an honest and entire consecration of body, soul, and spirit to God.

As the ark resting in the house of Obed-edom blessed all his family and all his possessions, so Christianity in the world sheds its benedictions upon all around, giving a tone of morality and respectability even to those who care little for it. It gives a higher tone to the unbaptized church-goer. It is an armor of defence to those like Nicodemus of awakened conscience and serious inquiry by night; and a strong tower to those who seek shelter within the inner walls of the church. But Satan is sometimes permitted to assault the faithful, as Job, as the disciples at Gethsemane, as Peter in the palace of the high priest. And as in

this newly developed psychic force we see with what absolute control Satan can bend the will of man to his purposes, so we find that control stopping only at the confines of the heart where the Spirit which Jesus sent to teach and to sanctify holds undivided sway.

We repeat that we are not here affirming hypnotism to be *in itself* an occult, diabolical, or forbidden agency. We regard it, however, as one of the instrumentalities which the magicians and sorcerers of old employed in the exercise of their powers.*

But to resume. From the latter half of the second century to the reign of Constantine, the Roman nation was steeped in superstition. The age of heathen faith, if such there had ever been, had passed away. All learning, philosophy, and cultivated intelligence was skeptical. But in the very nature of things which God has ordained, the mind of man cannot remain skeptical. If there be no true religion for the nourishment of faith, the mind, the enlightened, the cultivated, the philosophical mind turns to superstition.

The beneficent gods of early heathenism now became demons to be dreaded, and their once friendly worship was transformed into a worship of terror with dark and cruel rites. It

* See Appendix D.

was a fit soil for magic and sorcery. The bewitching of men and fields and beasts; charms and omens, transformations, conjurations of the dead everywhere prevailed. Murderous sorcery encircled great generals. The heathen emperors gave themselves to the study and practice of magic art. In the very palace of Diocletian, under Maximian, women and children were cut open alive for the inspection of their entrails. Books were written on the interpretation of dreams. Alexander Severus employed teachers to lecture upon auguries, wandering magicians swarmed in every quarter pursuing a lucrative business. The chambers of mystery were crowded to witness *table-tipping* and *spirit-rapping*. Lucian has made famous the swindles of Alexander of Abonoteichos. Men of consular rank, even the emperor Marcus Aurelius, asked counsel of him. What we know under the name of spiritualism, summoning the dead and holding converse with them, even to the materialization of spirits, was known and practiced.*

This was heathenism gone to seed. It was the reaction from skepticism. It was what could not coexist with an enlightened Christian faith. And when we mark the revival of "occult arts" in our own age, we may note also

* See Uhlhorn, "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism."

that it accompanies the skepticism of the age. Not as yet the higher skepticism of the learned, but when, planting themselves upon a "science falsely so called," they send forth their utterances against revelation, they make skeptics of the less enlightened, who, into the vacant chambers of their own hearts invite the evil spirits to come and dwell.

The devil lures men by appeals to their sensual nature, their love of pleasure, their greed, or their pride. Those who yield find their gratification as they go on. His service is not usually (except in the way of the retribution which it brings) one of privation and hardship. But the adepts in magic and sorcery, whether in the early centuries of the Christian era, in the middle ages, or in all ages, among the fakirs of India or the magicians of Egypt, have an ordeal to endure unequalled by any of the austerities of the fasting saints and ascetics of Christendom. In the mysteries of Mithras, for example, there were for the novices eighty disciplines, in endeavoring to accomplish which some lost their lives. There were extreme fastings, standing and lying in the snow and ice even for days in succession; the rack, flagellations, etc. Rigors of like kind are mentioned with great minuteness by Eliphaz Levi in his work on the "Dogma and Ritual

of High Magic." Jacolliot's work on "Occult Science in India" enumerates the various rigorous acts which the Indian fakirs and others have to endure.

There is recognized a distinction between magic and sorcery. The magician claims to hold the occult powers and spirits subject to him. They are his servants; but the sorcerer is their servant. Levi quotes from L'Abbé Trithème, "qui fut en magique le maitre de Cornelius Agrippa": "To call up a spirit is to enter into the dominant thought of that spirit; and if we raise ourselves morally higher than that same level, we shall draw that spirit with us, and he will serve us, otherwise he will draw us into his circle and we shall serve him."

Levi says that there exists in nature a force powerful as steam. "That force was known to the ancients. It consists of a universal agency whose supreme law is equilibrium, and whose direction tends immediately to the grand arcana of transcendental magic." Among the achievements possible to one who has it under control, "he can correspond in an instant from one extremity of the earth to another; see * * * that which passes on the other side of the world. * * * That agent which revealed itself under the manipulations of the disciples of Mesmer is precisely that which the adepts

of the middle ages called the Master of their great work."

This writer's account of what is required in order to become a sorcerer is too minute in its diabolical enumerations to quote. We therefore translate a parallel, but milder, passage from the writings of the celebrated Alphonse Paré, who flourished in the latter half of the sixteenth century. He says:

"No one can be a sorcerer who has not first renounced his God, his Creator and Saviour, and voluntarily made the alliance and friendship of the Devil—to acknowledge and adore him in place of the living God, and to give himself to him. And as for those who become sorcerers, it is by an infidelity and renunciation of the promises and assistance of God and by scorn of Him, or by vain curiosity to know secret things and the future."

A miracle, whether wrought by Satan or by the Spirit of God, is still a miracle. Both have like characteristics, only the powers that wield them are different. But as Satan is the author of all evil, and his angels are agents of wickedness, so intercourse with them is unlawful and spiritually perilous. Miracles are not to be sought or accepted from them.

Sorcery is acknowledged to be such evil intercourse. Magic, which claims not to be the

same as sorcery, still calls into operation occult powers by an agency which is not in answer to prayer, and is not of the Holy Spirit. The inference is, that though differing in name and in profession, magic and sorcery are substantially the same. The assertion that the magician is the master and the sorcerer the servant of the spirits, even if true, does not change the fact.

In his researches the author has met with statements of marvels supported by testimony which no unbiased mind can question. In any former age such would have been recognized as indisputably supernatural. In this age it cannot be proved that they are not supernatural. He is firmly persuaded that in opposing superstition there has been a swinging to the opposite end of the arc; a doubtfulness as to the ever active agency of God; the manifestations of His Providence in answer to prayer, and a thorough skepticism as to the exercise of miraculous power.

We are taking unwarranted ground when we assume that miracles have ceased. To prove that facts which have been reported to be due to miraculous agency are not supernatural does not warrant the conclusion that the supernatural is never manifest. In a scientific age the fear among clergy and laity of

being thought superstitious has, we are persuaded, caused the suppression of many evidences of the presence of agencies, whether good or evil, from the unseen world.

The rule for the believer to act upon is "try the spirits whether they be of God." There is special need of this in the present day. For, as the history of early skepticism shows that there were those who, unable to deny the miracles of apostolic and post-apostolic days, attributed them to magic, so in the revival of the "curious arts" the defenders of the faith meet the same sophistry under a new guise.

In a "Review of Modern Spiritualism" the Rev. Charles Beecher says: "A ritual of invocation, adjuration, charm, periapt, spell, will gradually construct itself with all the devices of the magic art, nor can the good advice of the more sensible men connected with the movement prevent it. Already the process is begun. Already Pythagorean regimen for mediums is hinted at." The same author remarks: "All things betoken that we are entering on the first steps of a career of demoniac manifestation, the issues whereof man cannot conjecture."

"Try the spirits, whether they be of God." As men lose their faith they do not find a permanent rest in skepticism. That is but a

transient abode for the faithless soul. Its home will be found in superstition. And as science in its gropings has exhumed a long buried satanic power, the next conflict will be not between religion and science, but, as of old, between religion and superstition. As a sound faith is a bulwark against "science falsely so called," so will it be found an effectual barrier against "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils."

CHAPTER XIX.

EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN MISSIONARIES.

Of late there has been a change in the trend of philosophy. The materialism of the last century is giving way to the spiritual. Even the occult has demanded and received the attention of learned investigators.

The Society for Psychical Research has recently been engaged in vigorous and thorough investigation of a kind of phenomena which, though usually scouted by the more intelligent as delusions, yet sometimes are attested by evidence which no thinking man can ignore. Of the facts and conclusions it is not our purpose now to speak. We wish to say most emphatically, however, that for some of these cases demoniacal possession is the only possible solution. That such possessions are not obsolete there is abundant evidence.

The Rev. John L. Nevius, D.D., was for forty years a missionary in China, in the ser-

vice of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. In China, as in other heathen countries, wherever he went he was told of demon possessions, like those mentioned in the New Testament. Of the facts the narrators, who were converts, were fully persuaded. They received without hesitation the New Testament accounts of demoniacal possession, being themselves familiar with such experience in their own land.

Dr. Nevius has given the result of his inquiries in a work entitled "Demon Possessions and Allied Themes."* The author died while the book was in press, and the publication was supervised and edited by his friend and co-laborer, the Rev. F. F. Ellinwood, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Of Dr. Nevius, Dr. Ellinwood gives the following testimony:

"Upon an acquaintance continued for more

* Rev. John L. Nevius, D.D.: "Demon Possessions and Allied Themes," being an Inductive Study of Phenomena of our own Times, with an introduction by Rev. F. F. Ellinwood, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and author of "Oriental Religions and Christianity." Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago, New York, Toronto. pp. 482.

than a quarter of a century I regarded him as a man peculiarly fitted to examine so intricate and difficult a subject.

"His philosophic insight, his judicial fairness of mind, his caution and his conscientious thoroughness appeared to me admirable qualifications for such a study. Moreover, his thorough mastery of the Chinese language, spoken and written, his intimate sympathy with the people, and his correspondingly truer interpretation of their innermost thought and life, have rendered him still more capable of ascertaining the real facts in the case, and of forming accurate judgments upon them. * *

"The cases have been carefully investigated, however, by several different missionaries, who have shared in the interest taken by Dr. Nevius, and no one of them appears to have any doubt of the veracity of the witnesses. Some of the facts also have passed under their own immediate observation."

We have another testimony in a response to a letter addressed by the author of the present volume to the Rev. Dr. L. W. Eckard. Under the date of July 11th, 1902, he writes:

"It is true that the missionaries, both in

China and India, have personal information of striking facts connected with diabolical possessions. My own experience has been limited, although living with Dr. Nevius at Chefoo for five years, and journeying often with him on his tours, I learned much from his conversation. His book neither does him nor the subject full justice. The most striking incidents he did not commit to writing. Some of them almost surpass belief, and I know he hesitated to express an opinion in some instances. Had he lived longer he would have fully verified and established some, at least, of these. It is almost thirty years since I went to China, and I would not now attempt even to supply dates, incidents, or names with such accuracy as to give my statements value for publication."

The diffusion of Christianity among the natives did not dispel the delusion, if delusion it was. Dr. Nevius at length determined to make a thorough investigation. This he soon found to be no easy task, for, as mission stations were established the phenomena were frequently concealed, or disappeared. Again, the well-known aversion of the Chinese towards foreigners rendered it difficult, and in

many cases impossible for missionaries to obtain access to the dwellings of the afflicted. Dr. Nevius says:

"A case of spirit possession in a family is, as a rule, regarded not only as a great misfortune, but as a disgrace. A man would be almost as unwilling to give information of this kind about a neighbor, especially to a foreigner, as to accuse him of theft without any personal grudge leading him to do so. Moreover, in this case he would not only fear the resentment of his neighbors, but still more that of the avenging demon. So I found the object of my pursuit a very *ignis-fatuus*, ever eluding my grasp as I approached it. I again, and not unwillingly, discontinued the investigation of the subject. It, however, often obtruded itself in the course of the ensuing years, and in such a way as to make the reconsideration of it imperative."

The investigations, therefore, must necessarily for the most part be made through the agency of the Chinese converts. He says:

"I. I have endeavored to give no evidence except that of Christian men and women of intelligence and worth.

"II. They testify to facts of which they

have been eye and ear witnesses, and which are for the most part of recent occurrence.

"III. The events to which they testify have not taken place in private, known to themselves only, or to a few others, but are of general notoriety, the witnesses to which could be indefinitely multiplied.

"IV. No conceivable motive can be adduced for fabrication or misrepresentation. These 'demon possessions' are even in view of the natives repulsive and disreputable, and they know that they are still more distasteful to their foreign teachers.

"This is not a hobby, or a subject which is to them of special interest or concern, as spiritualism, for instance, is to its adherents. On the contrary, it is associated with disagreeable experiences which they would gladly forget, and which under ordinary circumstances they seldom allude to."

There is a striking resemblance between these instances of demoniacal possession and those of the New Testament. Not only so, but in most of them, and frequently the most obdurate, the afflicted were dispossessed by the prayers and exorcisms of Christians. We select at random a few instances:

"I went to the place in company with a few other Christians. Arrived at the house, we found a large number of relations and neighbors assembled, and the woman wild and unmanageable, and several strong men with difficulty kept her under control. It was with fear and trembling that I commenced the work before me. When I addressed the demon, demanding that it should leave, the woman flew at me like a fury, exclaiming, 'Who are you?' I knelt down in prayer, the sweat streaming from every pore, and oppressed with an awful sense of personal weakness and responsibility. The woman was at once restored, and with unaffected surprise and chagrin apologized for the condition in which the visitors found the house. She was convinced of the truth and importance of Christianity, and commenced studying Christian books, but was afterwards restrained from continuing their study by the influence of the male members of the family. Her malady did not return."

* * * * * * * *

Here is a case that has a striking resemblance to one in Acts, xvi. 16–19, where the damsel possessed by a demon brought much gain to her masters by her soothsaying:

"Some years since, Mr. Niu was very much troubled by spiritual manifestations in his family. Strange noises and rappings were frequently heard about the house. The buildings were also set on fire in different places in some mysterious way. Everything went wrong. These misfortunes were supposed to be caused by a demon, which at times took possession of a female slave in the family. Mr. Niu made every possible effort to get rid of the demon, but without success.

"A Christian visited him about this time, and urged him to become a Christian in order to be free from the inflictions of demons. He found him, however, very reticent and timid. He talked as if he thought some one was overhearing him and ready to call him to account for what he said. A short time afterwards he was visited by another Christian, whom he frankly told he did not care to get rid of the demon; in fact, that he had made peace with it by worshipping it and giving it a recognized place and authority in the family. It had taken permanent possession of the female slave. It was consulted, and its advice followed in all domestic and business matters, and now everything went prosper-

ously. The female slave afterwards gained a great reputation for telling fortunes through the aid of her familiar spirit, and her fortune-telling was the means of making a great deal of money for her master. She was consulted by people from far and near."

* * * * * * * *

"Some time in the year 1868, in the fourth month of the Chinese year, Ho-kao, a preacher of the London Mission, was preaching in Fat-shan, and a portion of his discourse referred to Jesus casting out devils. After the service a man came and asked Ho-kao if he could cast out devils, stating that he had a son thus possessed, and if Ho-kao could give him relief he would be very grateful. Ho-kao replied that he could not, but Jesus did of old, and could now if He chose to do so. All that he himself could do would be to pray to Jesus, and that he would be very willing to do. Ho-kao then went with the man to his home in a village not far from Fatshan, and found that his son, a grown-up man, had been disordered for ten or more days, attacking people with knives and making attempts to set fire to the house, so that he had been chained to a tree, with a little mat shed near him to protect him when

it rained. The people were afraid of him. Ho-kao then prayed. As soon as the prayer was finished the chained man gave one or two leaps as high as he could, and then Ho-kao said, "Take off the chains." They were all afraid to do this, so Ho-kao himself took them off and led the man into the house. He was quiet, and seemed much exhausted, and soon fell asleep. The family wished to burn incense, etc., etc., but were told to do nothing of the kind. The father of the demoniac tore down everything pertaining to idol worship in the house, and would have nothing more to do with it thereafter. He soon joined the church, and has been in connection with it ever since. The demoniac has never had any return of his trouble."

The work referred to gives numerous well-attested cases of the kind; but those given above are all we feel at liberty to quote. There is, however, quite an extensive literature upon the subject, containing the results of researches carried on for many years in different countries. In 1874 Scribner & Armstrong published a complete catalogue of works on this subject, under the title, "Bibliotheka Diabolica."

APPENDIX A. (Page 25.)

The Hon. George Bancroft, in an article in the *New Princeton Review*, of May, 1886, entitled "The Seventh Petition," argues that, as the New Testament writers, in speaking of good and evil, frequently prefix the article—*the* good and *the* evil—meaning thereby not the good and evil person, but the good and evil thing or principle, so in the Lord's Prayer the expression "deliver us from the evil" does not necessarily mean the evil person. (Luke vi. 45; Rom. xii. 9.) But in each instance quoted by him in support of his position, the adjective is neuter, *τὸ πονηρόν*, *τὸ ἀγαθόν*, and therefore could not possibly mean the good person or the evil person. The difficulty is not with the article, but with the gender.

The same writer faults the Revisers for giving us in I. John v. 19, "the whole world lieth in the wicked one," instead of "in wickedness," as in the Authorized Version. Bishop Bloomfield, commenting on the same passage, says: "The best commentators are, in general, agreed that *τῷ πονηρῷ* is masculine, not neuter." He paraphrases the passage thus: "We assuredly know that we are of God and are His children, and that the world at large lieth under the dominion of the evil one."

To be consistent, Dr. Bancroft should object to the Revisers for adhering to the Authorized Version in I. John ii. 13: "I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one." Here the original has the article *τὸν πονηρόν*. So also in the parable of the tares: "Then cometh the wicked one," *ὁ πονηρός*.

In this same communication the writer uses language which denies the existence of a personal Devil at all. Hold-

ing this view, he could not consistently accept "the evil one" for "the evil." He says that the revised translation of the "seventh" petition in the Lord's Prayer "acknowledges a personal force at work in the universe, utterly evil in its purposes, a serpent on whose head no Saviour has placed His heel."

This subject was exhaustively treated in a discussion between Canon Cook and the Bishop of London, in 1881. The former, while admitting the existence of the evil one as the chief and most powerful tempter, claimed that the Revisers had not sufficient ground to justify them in changing the words of the petition in the Lord's Prayer from "deliver us from evil" to "deliver us from the evil one," though he admits that they might have been justified in placing it in the margin. They had pledged themselves to make such changes only as were *necessary*.

The whole controversy turns upon whether τοῦ πονηροῦ is masculine or neuter. We give our readers the benefit of the views of the two parties to this controversy. Canon Cook says:

"According to Scriptural usage ὁ πονηρός and τὸ πονηρόν are equally correct; a point on which the Bishop and I are equally agreed.

"The question as to whether τοῦ πονηροῦ and τῷ πονηρῷ in all or any of the passages where they severally occur are masculine or neuter cannot be decided on grammatical grounds. Whether on other grounds the masculine, as the Revisers, or as eminent critics cited in my letter, the neuter, is preferable, is a question certainly open to discussion; but I maintain that stronger reasons than any hitherto alleged would be required to prove that the alterations introduced into the text according to their view are NECESSARY."

The Bishop gives the following grammatical reasons for regarding "evil" in this petition as a person rather than an abstraction:

"If the Tempter is mentioned in the second clause, then, and then only, has the connection μὴ * * * ἀλλά * * * its proper force. If, on the other hand, τοῦ πονηροῦ be taken neu-

ter, the strong opposition implied by these particles is no longer natural, for 'temptation' is not co-extensive with 'evil.' We should rather expect in this case '*and* deliver us from evil.' Several of the fathers remark that S. Luke omits the last clause, *αλλά ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῦν πονηρῦν*, because he gives the prayer in an abridged form, and this petition was practically involved in the other. The comment is just if *τῦν πονηρῦι* be masculine, but not so if the neuter be adopted. Thus the context decidedly favors the masculine. Nor is it an insignificant fact that only two chapters before the Evangelist has recorded how the Author of this prayer found Himself face to face with temptation, and was delivered from the Evil One."

In the famous controversy between Whitgift and Cartwright, it appears that "the wicked one" was accepted as the correct rendering by both parties, and no question was raised as to the propriety of giving it any other interpretation. Cartwright arguing against the use of such petitions as those in the litany, which ask deliverance from temporal adversities and such calamities as lightning, tempest, etc., Whitgift contended that we were taught to do this in the Lord's Prayer, the model of our petitions, when we say "deliver us from evil." Cartwright's rejoinder is, that that petition "is understanded of the Devil, as *ἀπο τῦν πονηρῦν* doth declare; and it is a marvellous conclusion that, forasmuch as we ought daily, and ordinarily, and publicly, desire to be delivered from the Devil; *ergo*, we ought daily and ordinarily and publicly desire to be delivered from thunder." To this Whitgift replies: "Although the word signifies the 'Devil,' yet it nothing hindereth my interpretation, but maketh much for it; because the Devil is the author of all evil that cometh either to the body or to the soul; and therefore being delivered from him, there is no cause why we should be any longer careful." (Works of Abp. Whitgift, Vol. II., pp. 486, 487. Parker Society edition.)

APPENDIX B. (Page 98.)

I.

PASSAGES IN WHICH THE EXISTENCE AND PERSONALITY OF SATAN ARE DISTINCTLY RECOGNIZED.

Matt. xii. 26; Mark iii. 23; Luke xi. 18.

In reply to the accusation that he cast out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, our Lord distinctly recognizes both the personal existence of Satan and the reality of demoniacal possessions.

Matt. xiii. 39; Mark iv. 15; and Luke viii. 12: In the parable of the sower, Satan is represented as taking away the good seed of the word.

Acts v. 3: Peter says to Ananias, "Why hath Satan put it in thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?"

Acts xxvi. 18: "To open their eyes and turn them from the power of Satan unto God."

Rom. xvi. 20: "God shall bruise Satan under your feet."

II.

PASSAGES IN WHICH THE NAME SATAN OR DEVIL IS APPLIED AS A REPROACH OR REBUKE.

Matt. xvi. 23; Mark viii. 33: The Lord applies the name Satan, in rebuke, to Peter.

Acts xiii. 10: S. Paul says to Elymas the sorcerer, "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the Devil."

Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9: "The synagogue of Satan."

Rev. ii. 13: "Where Satan's seat is." "Where Satan dwelleth."

III.

THE NAME APPLIED TO HEATHEN DIVINITIES.

Levit. xvii. 7: "They shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils" (*seirim*).

Deut. xxxii. 17: In the song of Moses are the words: "They sacrificed unto devils (*shedim*), not unto God."

II. Chron. xi. 15: Jeroboam "ordained him priests for the high places and for the devils." This, no doubt, refers to the idols set up by Jeroboam as recorded in I. Kings xi. 28, 29. Some commentators regard the word devils here (*seirim*), as referring to goats, the worship of which Jeroboam is supposed to have brought from Egypt.

Ps. cvi. 37: "They sacrificed their sons and daughters unto devils."

I. Cor. x. 20, 21: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils."

Rev. ix. 20: "The rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood."

IV.

PASSAGES WHICH REPRESENT SATAN AS SEEKING TO LEAD INTO SIN, OR ACTUALLY DOING SO.

Job, chapters i. and ii.

Luke xxii. 31, 32: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."

Here our Lord discloses one of the secrets of the kingdom

of darkness. Satan, who had seduced our first parents and led astray more than one eminent servant of God, and who had endeavored to draw away Job from his allegiance, now desires to make all the twelve his own. He had just succeeded in setting them to contend with each other, as to who should be greatest. The Lord now says to Peter: "Satan hath desired to have *you* (plural, all the disciples), that he may sift *you* as wheat." But as Peter was to undergo a special ordeal, Satan, singling him out for a special trial, the Lord said: "I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not." The original signifies fail not *out* or fail not entirely. The denial was an act of moral cowardice, over which Peter wept, and from which he was speedily "converted"; and being converted he "strengthened the brethren."

V.

DELIVERED IN JUDGMENT TO SATAN.

I. Cor. v. 5: The Church's discipline of the fornicator—"To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh."

I. Tim. i. 20: "Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme."

VI.

CAUTIONS OR WARNINGS AGAINST HIM.

I. Cor. vii. 5: "That Satan tempt you not for your incontinency."

II. Cor. ii. 11: "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us, for we are not ignorant of his devices."

II. Cor. xi. 14: "And no marvel, for Satan also is transformed into an angel of light."

Eph. iv. 26, 27: "Be ye angry and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath, neither give place to the devil."

Eph. vi. 11: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil."

I. Tim. v. 14, 15: "Give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. For some have already turned aside after Satan."

I. Tim. iii. 6, 7: "Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. * * * Lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil."

I. Tim. iv. 1: "Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils."

James iv. 7: "Resist the devil and he will flee from you."

I. John iii. 8: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning."

VII.

PASSAGES WHICH DESCRIBE HIS CHARACTER OR HIS DEEDS.

I. Thess. ii. 18: "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I, Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us."

II. Thess. ii. 8, 9: "Then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume. * * * Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders."

Heb. ii. 14: "Him that hath the power of death, that is the devil."

James ii. 19: "The devils also believe and tremble."

I. Peter v. 8: "Your adversary, the devil, goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour."

I. John iii. 10: "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother."

Jude 9: "Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses."

Rev. ii. 10: "Behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried."

Rev. ii. 24: "Unto you * * * which have not known the depths of Satan."

Rev. xvi. 13, 14: "Unclean spirits * * * they are the spirits of devils, working miracles."

Rev. xviii. 2: "Babylon * * * is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit."

VIII.

DELIVERANCE FROM HIM.

II. Tim. ii. 26: "That they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will."

Rev. xx. 2, 7: "And he [the angel] laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years. And when the thousand years are expired Satan shall be loosed out of his prison."

IX.

HIS FINAL SUBJUGATION.

Heb. ii. 14: "That through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil."

I. John iii. 8: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Rev. xii. 9, 12: "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil and Satan. * * * The devil is come down to you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time."

APPENDIX C. (Page 123.)

NOTES ON JEWISH ANGELOLOGY AND DEMONOLOGY. FROM APPENDIX XIII., VOL. II., OF EDELSHEIM'S "LIFE AND TIMES OF THE MESSIAH."

Angelology. In Rabbinical literature "we have little of the Biblical in its purity. But added to it we now have much

that is the outcome of Eastern or of prurient imagination, of national conceit, of ignorant superstition, and of foreign, especially of Persian, elements. In this latter respect it is true—not indeed as regards the doctrine of good and evil angels, but much of its Rabbinical elaboration—that 'the names of the angels (and of the months) were brought from Babylon,' and with the 'names,' not a few of the notions regarding them. At the same time it would be unjust to deny that much of the symbolism, which it is evidently intended to convey, is singularly beautiful."

SATANOLOGY AND FALL OF ANGELS.

"The difference between the Satanology of the Rabbins and the New Testament is, if possible, even more marked than in their Angelology. In general we note that, with the exception of the word Satan, none of the names given to the great enemy in the New Testament occurs in Rabbinical writings. More important still, the latter *contain no mention of a Kingdom of Satan.* In other words, the power of evil is not contrasted with that of good, nor Satan with God. The devil is presented rather as the enemy of man than of God and of good. This marks a fundamental difference. The New Testament sets before us two opposing kingdoms, or principles, which exercise absolute sway over man. Christ is 'the Stronger One,' who overcometh 'the strong man armed,' and taketh from him not only his spoils, but his armor. (Luke xi. 21, 22.) It is a moral conquest in which Satan is vanquished, and the liberation of his subjects is the consequence of his own subdual. This implies the deliverance of man from the power of the enemy, not only externally, but internally, and the substitution of a new principle of spiritual life for the old one. It introduces a moral element both as the ground and the result of the contest. From this point of view the difference between the New Testament and Rabbinism cannot be too much emphasized; and it is no exaggeration to say that this alone—the question being one of principle, not

of details—would mark the doctrine of Christ as fundamentally divergent from, and incomparably superior to, that of Rabbinism. 'Whence hath this man his wisdom?' Assuredly not from his contemporaries.

"Since Rabbinism viewed the 'great enemy' only as the envious and malicious opponent of man, the spiritual element was entirely eliminated.* Instead of the personified principle of evil, to which there is a response in us, and of which we all have some experience, we have only a clumsy, and—to speak plainly—often a stupid hater. This holds equally trūe in regard to the threefold aspect under which Rabbinism presents the devil; as *Satan* (also called *Sammael*); as the *Lezer ha Ra*, or evil impulse personified; and as the *Angel of Death;* in other words, as the Accuser, Tempter, and Punisher."

APPENDIX D. (Page 220.)

THE SEERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The question may here arise whether some of the phenomena recently re-discovered have any relation to, or can throw any light upon, the prophetic gift of inspiration in its various manifestations. For trance, and what are called second sight, clairvoyance, or telepathy, bear strong resemblance to at least the lower manifestations of the divine influence in the seers and prophets of the Old Testament.

Samuel, as seer, possessed a faculty like that known to modern psychists as telepathy. Saul went to consult him about his father's asses, which had strayed. The seer, though he gave a higher response than Saul had sought, yet also informed him that the animals had been found and were safe at home. Saul had gone to him as an inspired person, "a man of God," a prophet. For the record reads, "He that is now called a prophet, was beforetime called a seer." So

* An analogous remark would apply to Jewish teaching about the good angels, who are rather Jewish elves than the high-spirited beings of the Bible.

also when Gehazi ran after the chariot of Naaman, Elisha, the prophet, sitting in his house, away from the scene of action, saw it all. Again, the testimony of one of the King of Assyria's servants was "Elisha, the prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the King of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bedchamber."

But while the seer's gift corresponds with phenomena now distinctly recognized, yet this does not prove it devoid of a supernatural character as an endowment of the prophets. The seers of the heathen claimed this gift, and in some cases may have possessed it. But their vision was confined to a knowledge of the ordinary affairs of life. They had not the higher gifts of the Hebrew prophets. With the latter as seers, "this condescension to the ordinary requirements of the people, which was to enable them to dispense with seeking counsel from heathen soothsayers, is an element kept quite in the background."—*Oehler.*

The faculty, or gift, may have been of the same nature in both cases; but in the one case used only at the divine direction; in the other as mere clairvoyance or soothsaying. This view would seem to be sustained by the character which Saul gave of Samuel: "Behold, now there is in this city a man of God, and he is an honorable man; all that he saith cometh surely to pass." This would imply that there were other seers who were not "men of God," and "honorable"; and that all that they said did not "surely come to pass."

APPENDIX E.

In Genesis vi. 1–4 occurs the following passage:

"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them,

That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose.

And the Lord said, 'My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.'

There were giants in those days; and also after that, when

the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown."

In chapter x. of this volume we had adopted the interpretation commonly received. But further reading and reflection have induced us to favor the earliest explanation. The difficulty lies, not in the words, but in the very great improbability involved in giving them a literal interpretation. If the "Sons of God" in the passage under consideration were angels, they must have been such as "kept not their first estate." They were therefore the host of Satan and were employed by him for the purpose of corrupting the whole human race, to bring under his sway all the descendants of Adam. As angels, they were called Sons of God. The inspired writer still retained that designation, although they had fallen. We submit that this solution is attended with fewer difficulties than the supposition that members of the Heavenly host, dwelling in the immediate presence of God, or sent forth as His messengers, could have become so enamored of the daughters of men as to become the Devil's angels, and forfeit the eternal bliss of Heaven for the eternal woe of the damned.

François Lenormant,* in his very learned work, "The Beginnings of History," says with regard to this passage:

"Without referring to the formidable grammatical difficulties which render doubtful the explanation of some sentences, where the translations most generally adopted are not always the best, the strange nature of the facts which one is obliged to accept if the story be taken literally, as an actual revealed history, has led many commentators to torture the text and deprive it of its natural meaning, in order to escape from the consequences which that would involve. Hence there is no traditional interpretation for this passage, the constancy and unanimity of which would have any weight with the student

* François Lenormant: "The Beginnings of History, According to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental People, from the Creation of Man to the Deluge." Translated from the French edition, with an Introduction by Francis Brown, Prof. in Union Theological Seminary. N. Y. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1882. pp. 588.

of to-day. Tradition has never succeeded in taking a fixed stand here; the predominant interpretation has varied with different epochs, and three principal systems, sustained by authorities of equal weight, but absolutely divergent among themselves, are set forth by Jewish and Christian doctors. For this reason criticism grapples with the expressions of the text untrammeled by any limitations and free to discuss their meanings.

"The fundamental difficulty concerns the true meaning of the two expressions, *benê hâelohîm* and *benôth hââdâm*, 'the Sons of God' and the 'daughters of man,' as designating these two classes af individuals, a union between whom is represented by the text as impious and unacceptable to God, and one of the most active factors in the general corruption of humanity, the result of which is to draw down upon it the punishment of the Deluge.

"Nothing can determine the sense but the study of the text itself, and the comparison of it with other passages of the Bible, where the same expressions may be met with. Now, it happens that the very two designations which have given rise to so many different theories are not unusual terms in Biblical language. On the contrary, these two expressions are of frequent occurrence in the prose as well as the poetry of the Bible, and with a perfectly certain and well-defined meaning, and a peremptory reason would have to be adduced, and it does not happen to exist, in order to fasten upon them, as they stand in the sixth chapter of Genesis, a different signification from the accustomed one."

In truth, there is not a shadow of doubt on this point, accepted in all the versions and by all commentators, that *benê hâelohîm* in Job i. 6 and ii. 1, *benê elohîm* in Job xxxviii. 7, and *benê êlim* in Psalm xxix. 1 and lxxxix. 7, is applied to angels. It is the same with *bar elâhîn* in the Aramic of Daniel iii. 25. As to *benê hââdâm*, with the article, or *benê âdâm* without the article, "the sons of man," and not "the sons of *Âdâm*," this is one of the most ordinary phrases of the Bible to express "men," just as "man" in the singular is *ben hââdâm* or *ben âdâm*, and this mode of speech passes from Hebrew into

the Greek of the New Testament, where ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου becomes the term appropriated to the designation of Christ from the standpoint of His human nature.

To my mind, therefore, the great majority of modern exegetes, and especially all those who evince the most profound philological knowledge of the Hebrew, have been justified in agreeing to recognize the fact that, as employed in this language, the terms *benê hâelohîm* and *benôth hââdâm* can signify only angels and daughters of the earth. Schneckenburger, de Wette, Arnaud, Stier, Dietlein, and Huther, in commenting on Genesis vi. 1–4, have thus understood it, and this meaning has also been adopted and defended with irrefragable arguments by the following named more recent writers: Ewald, Hupfeld, Tuch, Boehmer, Dilitzsch, Kurtz, Drechsler, Baumgarten, Von Hofmann, Twesten, Nitzsch, and Eberhard Schrader.

In 1894 there appeared in an English magazine entitled "Jews and Christians," an able and scholarly article from the pen of the Rev. Ralph W. Harden, B. A., now rector of St. John's, Monktown, County Dublin, Ireland.. Our readers cannot fail to be interested in his examination of the text Genesis vi. 1–4, evincing, as it does, not only much learning and research, but also showing how this passage forms the key to a large portion of Sacred Scripture, and demonstrating the presence and power of Satan through the history of the human race. As much of the exegesis follows in the same line as the extracts given above it will not be necessary to reproduce the whole article. Having described the various theories which have from time to time been advanced in elucidation of the text he says:

There is not, therefore, a shadow of excuse for departing from the one meaning—angels—which Scripture itself has furnished us as the meaning of *Sons of God*. If even it could be shown that the descendants of Seth were ever called by this distinctive title, or if there were the slightest ground for believing that Seth's posterity formed no part of the great mass of ungodliness that overspread the earth, or if the union of this posterity with Cain's sons could in any way explain or throw light upon the character of the Gibborim, the fruit

of this union, then we might see some cause to interpret the term otherwise than as God's Word explains it. But in view of the fact that all these are the most gratuitous, unwarrantable assumptions, I submit it is best to abide by God's Word written, and accept its own explanation of the Sons of God as the Jews and the early Church did, and write it *οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*—angels of God.

The passage in St. Jude just noted records the crime of a certain class of angelic beings. It does not, however, specifically connect these angels with the catastrophe of the Flood. Is there any Scripture that does indicate such a connection? I think we may point at least to two. The famous text (I Pet. iii. 19), Christ preaching to the Spirits in prison, exhibits, in my humble opinion, this view; and, moreover, it may, I think, be shown that this was the opinion regarding it held by the ante-Nicene Church. To examine this now would be impossible in our time. But there is another passage in the Second Epistle of St. Peter which unquestionably intimates a more than superficial or rhetorical connection between sinning angels and the Deluge.

The passage reads in the R. V. as follows:—

"For if God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment, and spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah with seven others, a preacher of righteousness, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, having made them an example unto those that should live ungodly; and delivered righteous Lot, sore distressed by the lascivious life of the wicked (for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their lawless deeds): the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment."

The omission of the article before *angels* indicates that a certain class, and not the whole order of angels, is spoken of —not all the angels, nor even all who fell with Satan, but those

of them who, when they sinned, were cast down to hell, and committed to pits of darkness. And these, in the ordinary exposition of commentators, are supposed to be set down by the Apostle as the first of three examples of Divine judgment. First example, the sinning angels. Second example, the Flood. Third example, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah. By this apparently lucid, but really very loose, exegesis, all connection between the angels and the Flood is lost, save the simple one of juxtaposition. And this may involve as little real relationship as that between the Flood and the destruction of the cities. But a closer, and, I venture to think, more intelligent examination of St. Peter's argument discloses a far more intimate and essential connection.

Led by grammatical considerations, from the opening words, 'If God spared not,' interpreters have very generally concluded that the *apodosis*—the consequent proposition—must denote destruction; as Winer expresses it, 'the Apostle intended to say, *so neither* (indeed, still less) *will he spare these false teachers;*' and thus one example of God's punishment after another has been accumulated. But suppose we first determine the *apodosis* as actually given by the Apostle himself, and then reason from it, we shall, I doubt not, be obliged to modify the list of examples. '*Apodosis extat*, ver. 9,' says Bengel—the *apodosis* is contained in verse 9. That is to say, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment.'

Here, then, we have a conclusion made up of two members; the chief and prominent factor being *the deliverance of the godly; the punishment of the evil doers* coming in only as subordinate. And with this conclusion in our hands there is no difficulty in making out the Apostle's *protasis*, or limiting clause, the antecedent. 'He preserved Noah;' 'He delivered righteous Lot.' These are the only two antecedents of deliverance to be found in the passage; and under these two must be grouped the subordinate clauses that speak of punishment. In the one case the sinning angels AND the ancient world. The cities of Sodom and Gomorrah in the other. Thus

the whole chain of the Apostle's reasoning is as clear as it is conclusive : if God preserved Noah, and spared not angels that sinned, neither the ancient world, when He brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly ; and if He delivered righteous Lot when, turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, He condemned them with an overthrow, then we may see clearly 'the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment.'

It is only in this way, I confidently maintain, by making *two, not three*, examples in the limiting clause (*protasis*) that we can establish the consequence (*apodosis*) of the Apostle in its completeness. But then, when this is done, we are as surely compelled to range the sinning angels and the ungodly antediluvians as co-subordinates existing at the same time, punished for the same offence, and overwhelmed by the same catastrophe, out of which the Lord preserved 'Noah with seven others.' The conclusion is inevitable. And, if so, we have an inspired writer of the New Testament sustaining the opinion of the early Church, that wicked spirits had a share in the wickedness that brought down the Flood upon the earth, and were still, in the writer's time, being held in durance, awaiting punishment for this sin.

Having thus endeavored to establish the meaning, *angels of God*, we may be asked : Of what consequence is the whole inquiry? How does this interpretation affect the revelation of God? What special truth does it evolve for man's acceptance? Now, it is from the answer to these questions that the whole subject really derives its importance. For if *angels of God* be the true rendering of *bne-haelohim*, we obtain at once a key, not alone to these earlier chapters of Genesis, but, indeed, to the whole revelation of God, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, as furnishing a history of the conflict between man and man's great enemy, Satan. We discover it to be the first act in the world's great drama, whose opening scene is laid in Eden.

'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt

bruise his heel.' It is unnecessary for my purpose to discuss how much is allegory, how much not, in this narrative of the Temptation. However the figure of the Serpent be explained, it is impossible not to recognize in these words the record of a historical fact, the declaration by the Lord God to the Tempter of an enduring enmity between him and the woman, and between their respective seeds, which should at length issue in the decisive victory of the seed of the woman. As Delitzsch well puts it: —

It is at first promised only that mankind will gain the victory, for הוּא refers to זרע אישה. But as the promise of victory speaks of victory over the Serpent, from whom the temptation proceeded, and hence directly of victory over the original Tempter, over ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος[55] (Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2=נחש הקדמון of the Midrash), the inference is obvious, that the seed of the woman would also be concentrated, and culminate in the unity of a person, one in whom the antagonism would be enhanced to its extreme tension, the suffering encountered in the conflict with the Tempter increased to the uttermost, and his overthrow completed by utter deprivation of power. It is, however, a mistake to think that הוּא has precisely a single personal meaning. The idea of הוּא is a circle, and Jesus the Christ, or the King Messiah, who, as the Jerus. Targum declares, will bring final healing of the Serpent's bite in the heel, is the centre of this circle, ever more and more increasingly manifested during the course of the history of redemption.

Assuming, then, the reality of such an author of the fall of man, hostile, subtle, powerful, is it at all reasonable to suppose that such a one, on hearing his future overthrow denounced, would straightway forbear his antagonism against the race destined to be his conqueror? Still less is it reasonable to think that the divine history would be silent on each successive effort of his hostility. Nor is it silent. Here, in the narrative of the Sons of God and the daughters of men, we have the culmination of the first attempt of Satan to destroy the race by making the promise to the seed of the woman an impossibility. The conflict is begun in the envy, hatred, and apostasy of Cain. The hand of the enemy may

be seen in the worldliness and ungodliness of Cain's descendants. It is this that stirs up their antagonism against the people of God, as witnessed to in the preaching and translation of Enoch. But when 'angels of God,' creatures of superhuman origin, keeping not 'their own principality,' forsaking 'their proper habitation,' 'saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose,' the unholy union gave speedy evidence of its Satanic source. 'The Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth.' 'And the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.'

But, I venture to think, the sacred narrative goes beyond a mere recital of prodigious wickedness. It hits at the design of the Enemy, the specific end he aims at, in the reasons assigned for the selection of Noah, as also for the all but utter destruction of man.

'Noah was a righteous man, and perfect in his generations: Noah walked with God.' We are always told that *perfect in his generations* means that Noah was upright among his *contemporaries*—'in contrast to them,' according to Delitzsch, identical with 'righteous before me in this generation' of vii. 1. And the substitution of *generations* for *generation* is explained by Delitzsch as 'the plural דרת, preferred in the priestly Thorah style (comp., on the contrary, דור vii. 1, Jahv.)'. But this is far from satisfactory. To say nothing of the difference of the two expressions, 'without blemish in his generations,' so unlike 'righteous before me in this generation,' which rather corresponds with 'a righteous man' in our verse, if the plural is the style of the so-called 'priestly Thorah' sections, it has a 'priestly Thorah' signification. And this is *not* 'contemporary,' *but* 'posterity.' The word in the plural occurs fifty times in the Old Testament, and always with this latter signification. For example, the 'house established for ever to him that bought it throughout his generations' (Lev. xxv. 30) means, 'it remained for ever for his descendants.' See also Num. ix. 10, where 'posterity' is actually the translation of the Authorized Version.

Therefore, what is really asserted by the words 'perfect in

his generations' is, that Noah was without blemish in his family, his children were uncorrupt, there had been in their ancestry no commingling of the angelic and the human. And hence they were not unfitted to continue the line of Adam, whence should spring the pure Seed of the woman, destined to make atonement for man's sin.

Again, take that most remarkable statement of Gen. iv. 12, in connection with the Deluge: 'And God saw the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.' If we understand 'way' here, with Delitzsch, to be 'the natural way of life, according to the limits and rules imposed at Creation,' and remember that it is *the way of the flesh*, rather than man, that is spoken of, it is impossible not to connect these words with God's law of the flesh (Gen. ii. 21–24), which concludes, 'and they shall be one flesh.' It is the Creator's own establishment of the holy ordinance of marriage, the unchangeable law—'they shall be one flesh.' And if we connect with this that difficult passage, Mal. ii. 15, we gather God's special design in this—'a godly seed.' 'And did not he make one? Yet had He the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed.'

Therefore, because 'the way of the flesh,' the holy law instituted by God Himself, was violated, and its end, 'the godly seed,' threatened with extinction, the doom of the corrupted mass was inevitable: 'The end of all flesh is come before me'; and consequently I do not consider it a strained or fanciful exposition to infer from the express declaration regarding Noah that he was 'without blemish in his descendants,' as well as from what seems to me the most natural reference of the words 'all flesh had corrupted his way,' the fact—that this appearance of these 'angels of God' on earth was in accordance with, and subordinate to, the malignant design of Satan against the human race.

But this continued effort on the part of Satan forms the subject of all subsequent Bible history. The world is re-peopled. But the seed which shall vanquish the Serpent is now confined within narrower limits, to the descendants of one man. 'In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed' was the word

spoken by Jahveh to Abraham. The conflict, accordingly, gathers round this family, and to it henceforth does the Bible narrative confine itself.

The study is a deeply interesting one, but space forbids me to do more than point out the analogy of the patriarchal history to the antediluvian record we have just been considering. Like it, this is a narrative of a constant struggle for existence. There are outward dangers, famine and war, the Philistine, the Canaanite, the Egyptian, menacing continually the prosperity of the seed. But far more significant are the domestic dissensions, begotten of envy, strife, or greed, that perpetually threaten the preservation of the one family in whom the welfare of all the families of the earth is bound up. The story of Cain and his descendants is repeated again and again, with various modifications, in the families of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. Renewed attempts to debase or impair the lineage may be traced in the lives of Sarah and Rebekah, in the stories of Hagar and Tamar, and in the foundations of future evil laid in the several families of Edom, and Moab, and Ammon.

And as in the Adamic, so in the Abrahamic story, the conflict has a crisis as truly diabolical. The chosen seed are imprisoned at last in Egypt, 'the house of bondage.' There the people were subjected to a service, the object of which 'was to break down the people morally and physically, to exhaust their vital power by overwork, and so to shorten their lives." Then followed the death-warrant of the male children at their birth, and subsequently another mandate that all should be drowned. The life of the nation was the end sought. But in this Pharaoh was only an instrument, an instrument energized by the Enemy, who enabled miraculously the magicians of Egypt to emulate the commissioned servants of Jahveh. 'They also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods.' I cannot take this to be anything less than exhibition, through Satanic agency, of god-like power, purposely manifested to deepen and complete the hostility against the chosen seed. I know it is the fashion, in deference to the spirit of the age, to represent these wonders of

the magicians as only pretended miracles, feats of jugglery. But this is itself a dangerous jugglery with Scripture. If the declaration that these magicians turned their rods into serpents, the waters into blood, and brought up frogs upon the land, be all and only a pretence, how can we be assured that the same miracles, told in the very same words of Moses and Aaron, are not merely pretended wonders also?

Once more, the struggle thus recorded against the life of the nation continues on through the wilderness march, and upon and after their settlement in the Land of Canaan, until the blessing receives a still narrower restriction—to the seed of David. The prediction was conveyed to him by the mouth of Nathan. 'I will set up thy seed after thee.' 'I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.' 'Thy throne shall be established forever.'

Henceforward the forces of the Adversary are directed against the royal house of David, and henceforward its fortunes become the care of the chronicler. The several stages of the conflict are too obvious to need recapitulation. But the particular aspect of one is too apt to be overlooked. I mean the real end designed by the Enemy in the revolt of the Ten Tribes from the House of David. That the apostasy of these, first to the calf worship, and afterwards to the more distinctly Satanic idolatry of Baal, had its effect on the whole nation, working out its degradation and destruction, is undeniable. But besides and above this is the direct bearing it had upon the very existence of the Davidic family, at the very moment when the promise to David seemed on the point of being realized in the person of the godly Jehoshaphat. At this moment an unholy affinity was established between his house and that of Ahab. And with what direct result? This—that three generations in succession of the royal family of Judah were cut off, until the promise centred in the life of Joash, an infant of less than a year old. For, first, Jehoram 'slew all his brethren with the sword.' He was succeeded by Ahaziah, his *youngest son*, 'for the band of men that came with the Arabians to the camp had slain all the eldest.' And finally, when Athaliah saw this youngest son, Ahaziah, slain by Jehu, 'she arose and

destroyed all the seed-royal of the house of Judah,' the infant Joash alone escaping. An issue so disastrous to the house on which it fell may be fairly held to be the end contemplated by the author of the temptation and apostasy which induced it.

And in this connection the same inference is forced upon us by the judgment foretold upon the sin of Hezekiah. 'Of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away, and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the King of Babylon.'

Thus we reach the limit of Old Testament history—the record, in brief, of the conflict waged upon mankind in general, upon the chosen nation, and lastly, upon the family of David. At the head of the narrative lies the key to the mystery—the figure of the Enemy, the declaration of war: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed'; the prediction of his overthrow: 'It shall bruise thy head.'

But so far the record is incomplete, the history unfinished. Only as regards the race and the nation have we learned the sublime truth, 'The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation.' The history that undertakes to deal with the fortunes of 'the seed of the woman' halts at the contest with the house of David. It publishes the deliverance of Noah and his family. It preserves the salvation of Israel from the land of Egypt. It records the everlasting covenant with David and his seed. But it leaves us with the seed bruised instead of bruising, with Satan in full possession of the field. Glorious hopes are held out to the nation and to the world, but all centring in the offspring of David, the 'rod out of the stem of Jesse,' the branch that shall grow out of his roots. But where shall this 'shoot' be found? Upon what must the Jew and the world erect their hope when the sacred history of the Jew fails to tell us where is the seed on whom these hopes must rest? True, we are given one gleam of assurance that the Hope of the Ages was not wholly extinguished during the Exile. The genealogy of I Chron. iii. 17-21 preserves for us the descendant of David, Zerubbabel, his eight children, and two grandchildren. But there the light expires. What Jew, all

the world over, can tell us where is the representative of the house and lineage of David to whom he and we may look as the promised seed ordained to bruise the head of the Serpent? It is a crucial question, and the nation which has given us the Bible, the people who 'have saved it out of the bankruptcy of the Roman Empire, and in the wild ruffianism of the mediæval migration of the peoples have preserved the dear book,' are called upon to account for the incompleteness of the revelation.

There is, too, a second questiou, which may be fairly, honestly, put to every candid inquirer among the nation that has both given and kept the Bible for the world. If the Jew fails to explain the mysterious break in the history of the contest, if he is unable to account for the disappearance of that royal line of David on which so much depends, how can he explain the fact that the New Testament history takes up the contest just where it had been broken off in the Old, and carries it down to its predicted end—except on the one supposition that the revelation in both is alike Divine ?

For, that the New Testament revelation continues that of the Old is apparent in many ways :—

1. It opens with the genealogies of Jesus, by which He is identified with the promised seed of the woman, sprung of the house of Israel, of the family of David. The royal family lost in the grandchildren of Zerubbabel here emerges in a pedigree which is the sole document to which the Jew can look for the inheritor of the throne of David. Let these genealogies be good or bad, the Jew can produce no other. If the promise to David concerning his seed holds good, if the words of the prophets are to have their fulfilment, then, with the Christian, and not with the Jew, is to be found the documents that alone in the world proclaim the rightful heir to the throne of David.

And this accounts, as nothing else will, for the unique exhibition of Satanic energy contemporaneously with the appearance of the promised Seed upon earth. It is the fourth great struggle of Satan to avert the overthrow predicted against him. In perfect harmony with his preceding efforts, here, too, his design against the Divine Person of the Lord is palpable. His

life is sought among the infants of Bethlehem, and thirty years later in Nazareth, in Jerusalem, in Gethsemane, till the 'man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron,' 'was caught up unto God, and to His throne.' We have, indeed, a word of Jesus Himself which shows us how, under all the efforts to slay Him, He discerned the agency of the personal enemy of man. To the Jews who were seeking His life He declares: 'Ye are of your father, the Devil, and the lusts of your father, it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning.' —*ἀνθρωποκτόνος*, literally, *a slayer of man*. 'In this very reference,' says Stier, 'He intends to direct their thoughts further back, to the Devil himself, whose mind, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, lusted for the death of man, and consequently to the corruption of man' of which, indeed, Cain was born.' And this *from the beginning*, he explains—'from the beginning of human history, from the time when men were for him to murder, since he first—who already existed, *ἦν*—appeared and attacked the human race.

2. Observe, again, this New Testament of the Christians recognizes a glorious future for the Jew, whence shall flow blessing to the world, a recognition strangely at variance with the practise of professed followers of Jesus exemplified in the histories of Spain and Russia. 'Whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises,'—whose *is*, not whose was or has been, is the recognition of St. Paul. And therefore, he holds, 'There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer; He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.' His teaching is not like that of many who dream that because the JEW of the Seed of David has brought blessing to the world He has therefore abandoned His own nation. On the contrary, St. Paul looks yet for fuller blessing upon the race through the intervention of the Jew.

3. And, finally, the close of the New Testament history is exactly what we should expect in a revelation purporting to be the consummation of the promises of the Old Testament. The Apocalypse terminates the series of the Sacred Books. And in it is detailed the termination of the contest. Here, for the last time, reappears man's Enemy in person, as when he first

appeared against man in Eden. 'That old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world.' Here, too, is the object of his hate—the woman bearing the insignia of the House of Israel, the Mother of the Son caught up to the throne of God, Who is to rule the nations with a rod of iron; the woman returned from her age-long vigil in the wilderness, only to fly thither again from the fury of her relentless foe. And here we have the Battle of the Nations against the Lord and His Messiah, and the binding of Satan, until, loosed out of prison, he makes his last attempt and meets his final doom.

Now, is this haphazard chance that guides the revelation of the New Testament to so fitting a conclusion? By what happy accident has it taken up the thread of the Old Testament narrative just where it was broken off, and carried it on with such stately progression to its glorious completeness? How is it that, in the teeth of Gentile hate, and, too often, of Christian jealousy, it has preserved his nation's future for the Jew—the tribulation and the glory? What compelled the Jewish personality of the Conqueror of Satan—'The Lion that is of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David?' What but the fact that its Divine history is the necessary complement of the unfinished story of the Old Testament!

Surely there is much to exercise the thoughts of Jew and Christian in this aspect of Divine revelation as a history of the conflict between Satan and Man. 'The New Testament,' writes a Jew, 'will never be understood of Christians until the Jews have devotedly investigated, analyzed, and annotated it.' There is truth here. Christians have—too many of them—yet to learn how closely Christ's coming victory over Satan is bound up with the nation. But has not the Jew also to learn—what his investigating, and analyzing, and notating may teach him—the continuity of the New Testament revelation—that without it his own Divine books contain a revelation only unfinished and incomplete?

УКАЗАНИЕ ОДНОГО
ЧЛЕНА
ЯВОУ ЧЕН

235.8
M429.3